Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/mennonite-quarterly-review_1930-04_4_2

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
(510) 649-2500

VOLUME IV NUMBER 2

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

APRIL 1930

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

THE DECLINE AND REVIVAL OF THE HUTTERITES
Johann Loserth

MENNO SIMONS ON THE INCARNATION I
Irvin E. Burkhart

AN AMISH CHURCH DISCIPLINE OF 1781

REVIEWS AND NOTES

PUBLISHED BY GOSHEN COLLEGE

$1.00 a Year 35 cents a Copy

CALIFORNIA BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Seminary Hills
Covina, California

Important Books on Mennonite History

MENNONITISCHES LEXIKON, VOLUME I, A-F, 1914-1925. *Edited by Chr. Neff, Th. D., and Chr. Hege.* Half-leather. To Mennonites, $6.00; to others, $8.00.

This is the first volume of the unique Mennonite Encyclopedia, published by the two German Mennonite editors from Weierhof, and Frankfurt a. M. The staff of contributors from Holland, Germany, and Austria is wide and authoritative, including such names as the late Dr. Bossert, Dr. Loserth, K. Vos, Dr. Rembert, Dr. Crous, Dr. Goebel, and others, and from America, John Horsch, Dr. C. Henry Smith, C. E., H. P., and H. J. Krehbiel, Dr. Elmer Johnson, David Toews, Dr. E. H. Correll, and many others. The volume is finely bound and illustrated.

DAS SCHWEITZERISCHE TAEUFER-MENNONITENTUM, TUEBINGEN, 1925. By *Dr. E. H. Correll.* $1.50 and $1.75.

The most recent, most scholarly, and most scientific monograph on the early and middle history of the Swiss Brethren and South German Mennonites. Considered by Dr. Walter Koehler of the University of Heidelberg, and John Horsch of Scottdale, Pa., as the best available work in the field. Aside from its historical value the book has interest and value as a sociological case-study of a most interesting functional group. It was reviewed from this point of view and praised by Dr. Maurer in his review in the American Journal of Sociology for March, 1926. Dr. Maurer says Correll's work "will be welcomed by those sociologists who are still interested in the possibilities of the Sermon on the Mount".

GEDENKSCHRIFT ZUM 400-JAEHRIGEN JUBILAEUM DER MENNONITEN ODER TAUFGESINNTEN, 1525-1925. Frankfurt a. M. $2.00.

This interesting and valuable collection of monographs was issued by the Conference of South German Mennonites at Ludwigshafen am Rhein in 1925 in commemoration of the Quadricentennial of the founding of the Mennonite Church at Zurich, Switzerland in January, 1525. It contains valuable studies by Dr. Ernst Crous of Berlin, Lic. Theol. B. Unruh of Karlsruhe, Dr. W. Koehler of Heidelberg, Dr. Chr. Neff of Weierhof, Dr. J. Loserth of Graz, and Chr. Hege of Frankfurt a. M. Of especial interest and value are Dr. Loserth's "Studies on Pilgram Marbeck", and the reprint of Pilgram Marbeck's "Vermahnung" of 1542.

MENNO SIMONS' COMPLETE WORKS. Elkhart, 1871. $3.50.

The only complete English edition.

HISTORY OF THE MENNONITES. Philadelphia, 1888. By *D. K. Cassel.* $1.50.

This title was once thought to be out of print. The entire small remnant has been secured by J. F. Funk and is now to be had. Not the best Mennonite History, but should be in the library of every one interested in the subject.

MAERTYRER-SPIEGEL. Lancaster, 1814. *Published by Joseph Ehrenfried.* $12.00.

A very small stock of this second American edition of the German Martyrs' Mirror has been secured. Ths edition is the finest produced. Bound in extra fine polished calfskin, good paper, and well-printed. The five copies on hand are all in perfect condition. An unusual opportunity for those interested in the Martyrs' Mirror. The copies are second-hand.

Most of the above titles are not to be had anywhere in the book trade in America. For sale by the Mennonite Historical Society, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana. Postage Extra, Prices net.

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Editor-in-Chief
HAROLD S. BENDER

Associate Editors

ERNST CORRELL
GUY F. HERSHBERGER
CHRISTIAN NEFF
JOHN UMBLE
BENJAMIN H. UNRUH
EDWARD YODER

VOLUME IV APRIL 1930 NUMBER 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 89

THE DECLINE AND REVIVAL OF THE HUTTERITES
Johann Loserth 93

MENNO SIMONS ON THE INCARNATION I
Irvin E. Burkhart 113

AN AMISH CHURCH DISCIPLINE OF 1781 140

REVIEWS AND NOTES 149

A Quarterly Journal
PUBLISHED BY GOSHEN COLLEGE
SANFORD CALVIN YODER, *President*
PUBLICATION OFFICE: SCOTTDALE, PENNSYLVANIA
EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE: GOSHEN, INDIANA

The Price of the Mennonite Quarterly Review is One Dollar a year, prepaid in American Territory, in Canada, and Mexico. For all other countries add twenty-five cents postage. Single copies, thirty-five cents postpaid. Subscriptions should be sent to The Mennonite Quarterly Review, Scottdale, Pennsylvania, or Goshen, Indiana.

Request for transfer as second-class matter from Goshen, Indiana to Scottdale, Pennsylvania, is pending.

Printed in U. S. A.

BRETHREN, I, FOR myself confess that I would rather die than to believe, and teach unto my brethren a single word or letter concerning the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, differing from the express, testifying Word of God.

—Menno Simons in 1550.

M547

VOLUME IV NUMBER 2

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

APRIL 1930

EDITORIAL

THE INTERESTING AND VALUABLE ACCOUNT OF THE VICISSITUDES of the Hutterite brotherhood in the latter half of the eighteenth century published as the leading article in this issue has been drawn by Johann Loserth from the *Kleine Gemeinde Geschicht-Buch,* or *Smaller Brotherhood Chronicle,* a copy of which had been sent by Elder Elias Walter of Macleod, Alberta, Canada, to Austria for editing and publication. Much of the same material, drawn from the same source, was presented by John Horsch in the third instalment of his series, *The Hutterian Brethren,* 1528-1928, in the REVIEW for January, 1929. The two articles were prepared for the REVIEW at much the same time, each author not knowing of the work of the other. Since the article by Dr. Loserth goes into greater detail and is prepared from a slightly different point of view, it has been found desirable to publish it, in spite of the partial duplication. The Hutterite chronicler who originally recorded the valuable material which serves as the source of the present article was Johannes Waldner. Readers of the REVIEW will be interested to know that the following works of Waldner are soon to be published, with the editorial assistance of Dr. Loserth, by the Eberhard Arnold Verlag, Bruderhof Neudorf, of Fulda, Germany: 1. *Das Gedenkbuch der Hutterischen Gemeinde,* 1525-1655. 2. *Die Schriften vom Niedergang der Gemeinde in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen.* 3. *Die Denkwürdigkeiten des Johannes Waldner.*

Although the Anabaptist movement produced a cloud of witnesses it did not produce many men learned in theology. Throughout the subsequent history of the movement it has been characterized by a simple faith, expressed chiefly in the direct words of the Scriptures, with a dislike for the theology of the schools which has at times amounted to a distinct aversion. In many sections of Mennonitism even today the term "theologian" is a name of opprobrium. Much of this aversion is traditional and dates back to a time when "the theologians," namely the state church Lutheran, Zwinglian or Calvinist ministers, were the active agents in the persecution of the Anabaptists. It was the "theological doctors" who attempted to controvert the plain teachings of the Word of God by their learned circumlocutions. That much the Brethren learned at the numerous colloquies and debates where their faith was challenged. It was the theologians who urged the political authorities to brutal suppression of the Anabaptists for dissension from the theological formulas of the official creeds, while they openly tolerated corruption and gross unchristian living in all classes from the highest to the lowest. It was the learned doctors who had learned to split intellectual hairs but who had not learned to take the Lord Christ at his word and follow him. No wonder theology and theologians made little headway among the Brethren whether in the Swiss highlands or on the Dutch lowlands.

But among the Dutch Brethren there were several leaders of considerable intellectual ability who devoted considerable effort and thought to a clear statement of the teachings of the Bible on matters of faith, and who in consequence became able expounders of biblical doctrines. Chief among these was Menno Simons (1496—1561). His works do not rank with the greatest of the reformers but they rank high in sincerity, simplicity, clarity and fidelity to the Scriptures.

Now it was Menno's fate, as it has been the fate of theologians before and since, to flounder somewhat in an attempt to describe the mode of the greatest of the mysteries of the Christian faith, namely the incarnation. As he floundered his enemies pounced upon him, supposing at last to have found the weak point in his doctrinal armor. Drawn into a discussion of his own half-formed notions against his will he was led to an attempted definition of the mode of the incarnation which has since been the subject of much criticism and apology.

Readers will welcome the discussion of "Menno Simons on

the Incarnation" by Irvin E. Burkhart in this issue. Professor Burkhart here presents what is the first detailed discussion of the historical origin and significance of the view held by Menno Simons, thus enabling a fair appraisal of the view. Although only the first half of the article appears in this issue, the editors are confident that the readers will be convinced before they have read far that Menno has been abused in the past rather than understood both by his enemies and his historians, and it may be that Menno's attempted solution of the intellectual problem involved in a Holy God assuming the form of fallen man will not commend itself to many. But then what better solution can others offer. It is best perhaps to leave the mystery unsolved as Menno really wished to do.

Mennonite and Anabaptist doctrine and practice, like that of all other religious groups, have undergone a certain amount of change and development. The last half-century has witnessed great progress in church organization and often elaborate conference regulations on questions of doctrine and practice. Along with this has gone the effort to make the practice as uniform and as universal as possible. Particularly true is this of the Mennonites in America. That this is a comparatively modern tendency is testified by the letter of Bishop Johannes Nafziger of Essingen written in 1781, a translation of which is published in this issue. The letter is a statement of the discipline followed in Nafziger's church and was written at the request for information of certain Mennonites in Holland. The introduction suggests, however, that Nafziger was rather reluctant to have his written statement used as a discipline even in his home district. He questioned whether this was the best way to honor God and to advance the Kingdom. Would it make for peace or for strife in the church? Might it lead to the development and growth of pride? He hesitated because such a step would be a new departure. At the close of the epistle one finds an expression of rather fine humility and a sincere request for suggestions for improvement of his statement which was admittedly imperfect.

The publishers are pleased to announce the appointment of Dr. Christian Neff and Lic. Theol. Benjamin H. Unruh, two prominent European Mennonite leaders and scholars, to the editorial staff of the Review thus increasing the number of associate editors to six. Dr. Neff, for years a bishop and pastor at Weierhof in the Palatinate, is one of the editors of the *Mennonitisches*

Lexikon, of the *Gemeinde Kalendar,* and also of the *Mennonitische Blaetter.* It is planned to publish an article from the pen of Dr. Neff in the near future on "The present situation among the south German Mennonites." Professor Unruh, the author of numerous books and articles, was formerly a leading educator among the Mennonites of Russia, a professor in the noted school at Halbstadt. He was one of the four delegates of the Russian Mennonites who came to the United States in 1920 to prepare the way for the great emigration and has since been the European representative of the Russian Mennonites. At present he is a professor in the technical university at Karlsruhe, Germany. He will write a series of articles for the REVIEW, dealing chiefly with Mennonitism in Russia.

THE FOLLOWING BOOKS ARE REVIEWED IN THIS ISSUE:

J. Loserth—
Pilgram Marbeck's Antwort auf Kaspar Schwenckfeld.
H. H. Fisher—
The Famine in Soviet Russia, 1919-1923.
P. C. Hiebert and Orie O. Miller—
Feeding the Hungry, Russia Famine, 1919-1925.
American Mennonite Mission in India—
Building on the Rock.
General Conference Mennonite Mission in India—
Twenty-five Years with God in India.
Cornelius Weygandt—
The Red Hills.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

JOHANN LOSERTH: Professor emeritus of church history at the University of Graz, Austria.

IRVIN E. BURKHART: Professor of church history and Bible in Hesston College, Kansas.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN: Retired professor of church history, Austin, Texas. Author of *A Manual of Church History; History of Antipedobaptism,* etc.

EDWARD YODER: Dean and professor of ancient languages, Hesston College.

THE DECLINE AND REVIVAL OF THE HUTTERITES

JOHANN LOSERTH

Of the various Christian denominations, the Hutterite brethren, a wing of the Anabaptists named after their founder Jacob Hutter, may without doubt lay claim to the greatest number of martyrs, that is in proportion to the total membership which in the case of the Hutterites would amount to about a half million. This group of Anabaptists kept from the beginning a record of its martyrs. At first they were kept in memory in martyr hymns, which later were transferred into prose and finally collected in the great basic church chronicle known as the *Grosse Gemeinde Geschicht-Buch,* which had an official character and from which the various lesser church chronicles drew their material, whose publication we owe to Josef Beck.[1] In Beck's time the *Great Chronicle* was considered lost. Since then however it has come to light and was published by Rudolf Wolkan in 1923 with the title, *Geschicht-Buch der Hutterischen Brueder* (Macleod, Alberta, Canada). The remarkable history of this book has meanwhile been uncovered.[2] In the *Geschicht-Buch* we find a list of martyrs which totals 1625 persons, which is certainly a high percentage in comparison with the total number of Anabaptists. The figures for Styria with 25 and Carinthia with 18 are, it is true, insignificant in the light of the fact that the Count Palatine alone had 350 Anabaptists executed; but they [the latter] are to be explained by the fact that the Lutherans (Augsburg Confession) were required for their part as well not to tolerate any heretics and hence exercised a very circumspect supervision.

Nevertheless we can be sure that Carinthia not only produced one of the most original Anabaptist leaders in the person of Antoni Erfordter, but actually had a much larger number of martyrs than is recorded. We know for instance that many of the Lutheran exiles who were expelled in 1755 from Carinthia defended the very prime articles of the Anabaptist faith, and hence very likely were themselves descendants of the earlier Anabap-

1 Ff. rer. Austriac. 2 abt. Bd. 43.
2 *Mennonitisches Lexikon* II, 91-96.

tists. At the beginning of the second half of the eighteenth century there arose in Carinthia a vigorous movement[3] in the Lutheran Church (as we now know from a hitherto unknown source) due to the teachings and writings of Dr. Martin Luther as well as later authors such as Johann Arndt, Joseph Scheidberger and Christoph Fischer. This movement has come to light through the pen of a Hutterite historian, Johannes Waldner, who has hitherto been totally unknown, and who himself, though at that time but a boy, with his father George Waldner as a member of the Lutheran Church in Carinthia, was exiled to Siebenbuergen[4] where with a considerable number of his fellow-countrymen he joined the Anabaptist group. Waldner relates how the books and writings of the above-named authors were brought secretly into the land and aroused a great zeal among the people. "The farmers commenced to stay away from church, read the Bible and other writings at home, held meetings in the nighttime even when it rained or in spite of snow and wind, where they met for discussion."

The movement spread throughout the land, especially in the Gail valley, at Peternion and in the Himmelberg and Spital districts. In the following years severe investigations were undertaken. Whoever was suspected of possessing Luther's books was brought before the priest and if proved guilty was fined from twelve to twenty-four guilders according to the size of the books. A mandate of the government required that all books should be surrendered, upon which the heretical books were confiscated and the others returned to their owners with a stamp indicating their orthodoxy. The result was unsatisfactory since the people did not surrender their forbidden books but rather preserved them all the more carefully. Stricter inquisitions followed, but the only result was increased resistance. Luther's teachings were condemned from every pulpit and finally the governor, Johann Turteltaub, was ordered to "cleanse the archduchy of Carinthia of the heretics." And that, says Waldner, brought the crisis.

All those who confessed the Protestant faith and were not willing to give up their faith had to sell their possessions and leave the land. They were not sent into another country where they would have strengthened the Protestant forces but were sent into Siebenbuergen where on command of the Empress Maria

[3] This movement must not be confused with the movements reported by Karl Reissenberger and Hans V. Zwiedinck in the Korrespondenzblatt f. Siebenb. Landeskunde XXIX, 10. u. 11, and Archiv f. Oestr. Geschichte LIII, 531.

[4] Siebenbürgen, the German name for Transylvania.

Theresa, dwellings, land and meadow, were to be provided for them at specific places.

Thereupon many young people (1755) left parents, friends and relatives, as did "our fathers," says Waldner. He names them all, and we must give their names, since for the most part the names still are to be found among the Hutterites. One was Hans Kleinsasser, later for many years, bishop of the brotherhood in Siebenbuergen and leader of his people in the flight across the Transylvanian Alps into Wallachia, then into Russia, where these exiles were permitted to live many decades in prosperity. Another was George Waldner of Amlach, with his wife and three children, among them the one who later became the historian. Further, the families Glanzer, Hofer, Müller, Nägeler, Gerl, Egartner, Platner, Resch, Amlacher, Winkler and Bichler. These are the names only of those of the exiles who become Anabaptists in Siebenbuergen, and whom Johannes Waldner calls "our fathers" in his narrative. The total number of the exiles was naturally much larger.[5]

The officials provided wagons in which the women and children were transported, their property was enlisted and appraised, and, says Waldner, the promise was given that the sale price would be sent to them. The journey went from Klagenfurt through Styria into Austria. In Yps on the Danube they had to wait two months for stragglers so that the number finally totalled 270. In September the journey was resumed "through Vienna, Pressburg, and Ofen (Budapest) to Peterwardein where they had to pull the ships through the canal as far as Temeswar." The further journey was by land to Sasswar and thence to the village of Romos where they were to stay. They arrived in October, 1755.

After a few days a Lutheran magistrate by the name of Kraft appeared in company with a Lutheran pastor and explained to them the intent of the crown. "Since you could not remain in Carinthia where the Catholic religion alone is tolerated, the empress has sent you here. Here you may have the Gospel as you desire it. In order to be sure of your loyalty she requires an oath of allegiance from you."

However a group of the exiles was not willing to comply with this request. They had been driven from their homes on

[5] Reissenberger in *Zt. f. Gesch. der Prot. in Oestr.* VII, p. 83. But Reissenberger did not know that some of them became Anabaptists. Nor did he know anything of their later migrations from Siebenbürgen by way of Russia to America.

account of the Gospel and now they were to be required to swear contrary to the Gospel. "How can you," cried Mathias Hofer, "demand of us what Christ (Matt. 5, James 5) forbids." "You can read well indeed," replied the magistrate, "but you have no understanding. Read Romans 13, 'Whoever resists the authority'." No agreement was reached. The majority yielded and were given dwellings, fields, and meadows. But the minority refused to yield, and rather declared "that the Lutheran church did not live according to the Gospel." "Our fathers," says Waldner, "would not permit themselves to be compelled to do anything contrary to the Gospel, in spite of the fact that they had accepted the Lutheran faith." Excluded from the privileges of the others, they accepted positions as servants in hire until the next spring, either as laborers in the villages or as independent craftsmen. Two of them, Andreas Wurz and George Waldner, father of the historian, secured work at Alwinz, a village but a half day's journey removed from Romos, where Bethlen Gabor had earlier provided a refuge for the Anabaptists who had been driven out of Moravia, and where he had granted them privileges which protected them from persecution during the Counter Reformation. Elsewhere in the land the Carinthian exiles found no friends, but here they learned to know people who agreed with them in the important articles of their faith, people whose manner of preaching appealed to them, and whose writings and books pleased them.

The Brethren in Alwinz gave them, in addition to some of their books, their common prayer. George Waldner prayed and read to them. Since they had no minister, they helped themselves as best they could in their simplicity. One should probably consider Mathias Hofer, the one who had so sharply rejected the oath, as religious leader of the little group. He maintained the close connection with the brotherhood in Alwinz. His trade was that of potter.

Although the Alwinz brotherhood no longer held its former high position, since it had surrendered the principle of community of goods, the heart of the teachings of their faith had been preserved unblemished. Due to association with them, the Carinthian exiles became Anabaptists, and assumed the burden of suffering and persecution which was to be their lot, since they as foreigners did not enjoy the privileges which the Alwinz brotherhood possessed. They were persecuted from two sides, by the Protestants, and to a greater degree by the Catholics. These are all facts which the historian Waldner relates in detail in a fresh,

lively manner, partially out of his own experience and partially out of the memory of his father, details however to which we can but briefly refer.

The dwellings which the little group received were in Gros-Polen, says Waldner, meaning Grospold. The evangelical pastor here received the commission to convert the newly formed Anabaptist group, but, says Waldner, "he was able to accomplish nothing, for God who is strong in the weak stood by them faithfully, the brethren remained united, separated themselves from the Lutheran villagers, and held their own worship on Sundays in the house of Andreas Wurz." It is true that each pastor in a village where individuals of this group were brought received instructions to receive them and insist on regular attendance at church services, and permit them to receive a dwelling and land, but the exiles refused to accept the same since they still hoped to be reunited. Meanwhile they lived "as pilgrims and guests," worked as day-laborers, and visited one another. This continued for a year and a half.

In April, 1761, George Waldner moved from Hannendorf to the home of Brother Hans Kleinsasser at Creutz. In a short time George Gerl and Joseph Müller also came to Creutz with their families. The village at first permitted this since the newcomers were faithful laborers. As the Anabaptist group gradually grew larger, it was decided to establish a "Christian order in spiritual and temporal things," in which purpose the brotherhood at Alwinz gave them aid.

There was a daily assembly for prayer and the praise of God. If anyone was found guilty of wrongdoing he was punished. Joseph Müller was made steward of temporal things, a common kitchen was established under the direction of Dorothea Naegeler, certain ones were appointed to provide for the clothing, and all labored for the common treasury (as the brotherhood in Moravia had formerly done), each one according to his ability. Individual Anabaptists who were living at other places joined the new community, not however to the satisfaction of the other inhabitants of Creutz, who were displeased with the increasing number.

At this point the village of Alwinz received the command from Hermannstadt that they should not shelter the heretics from Creutz, but should arrest them and deliver them to the authorities at Hermannstadt where they were to labor in the

prison like other prisoners. A poet of the brethren describes the situation thus:

> They took us away from our Christian congregation
> And brought us to Hermannstadt in incarceration.
> There we suffered much shame and despite,
> Which we carry to Thee, O Lord, our God.

The incarceration continued "a year and many days." "They gave us a groschen and a piece of bread a day."

The officials considered it possible to convert these people from Carinthia from their faith by quartering them separately in various localities. So they sent one to Kokelburg, another to the district of Mediasch, a third into the Repes district, etc. But, says Waldner, "God provided that within ten days they knew of each other's whereabouts, and thus they were able to maintain fellowship in spite of the spatial separation."

At the end of April, 1762, Hans Kleinsasser and Joseph Müller received baptism and in 1763 the former was chosen bishop (Vorsteher) of the congregation and received instruction in all the things necessary to his office. The congregation now had a shepherd, teacher and guide, "a helpmate for their joy, and they accepted him as a gift from God." And it may also be added "likewise a participant in suffering," concerning which the historian tells us in detail.

In September, 1763 Brother Hans Kleinsasser returned from a visit with certain imprisoned brethren in Hermannstadt with the news that the empress, who had just concluded peace with Prussia, was intending to cleanse her land of heretics. Since the Lutheran clergy had not succeeded in converting the heretics, the Catholics were to receive the commission. Thereupon in November the persecution began under the Jesuit Delpini, and was carried through with great zeal, which our historian relates in great detail. It began to appear as though the congregation of the faithful would be annihilated, and consequently they began to plan a secret escape from the land.

Two brethren from Alwinz, Joseph Kuhr and Johannes Stahl, set out to seek new homes for the brotherhood, and decided to make a journey of investigation across the little Carpathian mountains and further in the spring into Moldavia and Wallachia. Wallachia offered the best prospects, since freedom of religion was guaranteed and Germans were welcome. Further no ground rent nor tribute had to be paid. With this information they returned home over the Siebenbuergen Mountains, "a

cruel mountain chain," by secret ways, for both Kuhr and Stahl had been expelled from the land.

When they arrived at home they learned of the terror which had been begun by the Jesuit Delpini. After the failure of the final attempt at conversion by scattering them individually among the villages, the authorities decided, upon a proposal by Delpini, to take the children of the Anabaptists from them and place them in the Hermannstadt orphanage, while the adults were to be driven from the land. A great terror came over the brotherhood. At this point Brother Joseph related the results of the journey of investigation. In Moldavia and Wallachia there would be plenty of room and liberty for them. This gave the brethren courage to make the journey. But first they had to get information in Kronstadt as to the safest route by which the group could cross the mountains into Wallachia. There they secured four Wallachians as guides and prepared their baggage with the necessary clothing and bedding in sacks and bags. Although the journey was a dangerous one, they dared not despair for the sake of the children. Transport was arranged, but when the wagons failed to arrive they used their own wagons.

The departure, says Waldner, was pitiful to see. The brethren and sisters and the youth from fifteen to seventeen years, each took a staff in his hand, a bundle on his back, and many a one a little child in addition. The little children who were as old as five years also had to go on foot. And so the march began in the name of God. The officials of the village and the burgers and peasants looked on. Many were glad to get rid of the Anabaptists while others were afraid of the authorities since they were letting them depart unmolested in broad daylight.

> But the way of the believer is ordained by God. The departure took place on the third of October, 1767, at ten o'clock in the forenoon from Creutz. The brotherhood had lived here for six years in the simplicity of Christ, according to the discipline and practice of the apostolic church, practicing community of temporal goods and separation from the world. Ban and excommunication was used against the evildoers and a strict discipline of the children was exercised.

The account of the journey across the mountains is a moving story. Here is just a sample from the latter part of the march, after the hard part was past, the morning of the last day.

> In the middle of the forest we came upon a steep stone wall. Here we had to pitch camp and halt for the day. Our bread and

other food had come to an end. The guides had to go back to bring us some bread and flour in the evening. After we had eaten, the march was resumed. We began to climb until we had passed beyond the forest and come upon the bare rocky mountain side, and after we had reached the height, we stopped a bit. "Now we have won," said the guides. "We have passed the border into Wallachia, there is no more danger." We freed the dogs which we had brought with us. From the height of the pass where we were we could look back in the moonlight upon the beautiful scene in the Burgenland, with the scattered villages upon the plain. Gradually we descended the other side until daybreak, when we came to a brook where we made camp. Here the entire company held a service of prayer and thanksgiving, and praised the Lord who had saved his people from the might of the false prophet and soul-murderer, so that none had been lost or suffered harm.

The first night in Wallachia was spent in camp in the forest. Fire was made to dry our clothes. There was plenty of wood and water, but food was lacking. In the evening each one received a small piece of meat, and a little porridge of buckwheat flour. The next day we journeyed further, hopeful but hungry, reaching an inn by ten o'clock in the forenoon. Here we wanted to refresh ourselves but got nothing but some millet flour and milk. Each one also received a little wine.

On the twenty-first of October they arrived at Plojest. Here they had to go to the magistrate. He enrolled their names and offered to take them at once upon his land at Tschakerlein, a rough wilderness, with good soil but no wood for building purposes. Joseph Kuhr and Hans Kleinsasser went to Bukarest for information. There they met a German from Saxony who said to them, "Come with me to my district; if you like it you can live beside me." So they came to Tschorregirle, (German Krahbach). It was the sixteenth of November, winter was at the door, and still no dwellings. So they built earthen huts according to the custom of the land. "It was indeed something strange for us to live in the ground, but we had peace and quiet and above all complete freedom of conscience." Unfortunately Wölfl (the Saxon neighbor) died in a short time. From his heirs they bought his house, garden, a portion of land, cattle, bee-hives, and household goods, all for 200 florins German money. This took place on January 27, 1768. So they came through the winter and began to start handiwork again with spinning and weaving. In the spring they began to plow and sow the summer grain. With hard labor they succeeded in clearing a piece of land for an orchard, also planted a vineyard, and started to build houses. Unfortunately, sickness and death disturbed the new found happiness.

The building had to be postponed, and in addition war broke out between the Turks and the Russians. It turned out that there was no good water for drinking in the place, so they began to think of moving to another place where they could have fresh water to drink, and lived two winters longer in the earthen huts. The relations with the Wallachians also became unfriendly as the result of a circumstance which we shall relate since it concerns difficulties in matters of faith between the newcomers and the natives who belonged to the Greek Orthodox church.

"On all the highways and crossroads were set up wooden crosses before which the natives bowed and made the sign of the cross on forehead and breast, which our youth considered idolatry and blindness." Not exactly for this reason but rather as a childish prank, one of the youth damaged a cross. On being scolded by an older person he replied, "Do you intend to help this idolatry?" A Wallachian had observed the occurrence, upon which a severe penalty rested as punishment, namely, loss of the right hand and a fine of five hundred pieces of money. The matter was adjusted only with the greatest difficulty.

In the spring they moved to Presetschein. Here they settled on a nobleman's neglected estate, where they began to build on some open land. Unfortunately the war prevented orderly progress. Raids, robbery, plundering, and mistreatment were regular happenings, and are recorded by the historian from his own memory as one of those who participated in the suffering. Once the bishop, Hans Kleinsasser, was taken from a sick-bed, dragged into the courtyard, whipped and beaten, because the brotherhood was not able to pay the raiders the money which was demanded. Scarcely was one troop gone till another appeared. In this time of great need the future historian prays: "O Lord, wilt thou permit thy church to suffer such an end, and thy truth and light to disappear from the earth? It cannot be." And God did not permit it, says Waldner.

Under such conditions it was impossible to remain in the land. At the beginning of the year 1770, they requested a letter of protection from the Russian general, Sametin, and said they wished to settle in a land with peace and safety, if they but knew where. They had lost everything in this war and lacked the necessaries of life. The general had sympathy for them; since the war had extended over all Wallachia, Moldavia and Poland, he advised them to settle in Russia. He furnished them a wagon with a pair of oxen, and gave them a passport with the informa-

tion that on their way they would come to the army headquarters, where they would find Fieldmarshal Count Romjanzow, the commander-in-chief. He would help them further.

So the brethren sold the little which had been left by the plundering raiders and gathered in this manner a few gulden again, "which we ourselves marvelled at." On the tenth of April the little company set out again. The departure remained forever in the memory of the writer, a moment of grief and gladness at the same time. Once more they went to Presetschein, where they would have been so happy, had it not been for the war. It was a beautiful sight on that spring morning, the birds were singing so happily, the meadows were covered with flowers, everything was in the lovely bloom of spring, so that it was after all difficult to leave this fruitful region. And yet it had to be. The entire district had been depopulated, everyone had fled. "We traveled past Bukarest," says Waldner, "and came on Easter day to Wusna." Everyone was afraid of an attack by the Turks. By way of Rybnik they came to Foknhain, then to Rumän, and the Seresk. They passed Jassy on the left, and came to Bottuschan where a horrible pestilence had ravaged. The houses were empty, the dead were lying unburied in the streets. Passing over the Pruth they came on the nineteenth of May to the Dniester. The privations on the journey were indescribable. Seldom did they sleep under a roof even in times of rain and wind. Their clothing was poor, and they were glad to come to a village where they could get wood and water and find some pasture for the cattle. Often they longed for the time when they could at least again eat their fill of dry bread. "How anxious we were to work, and how we would have praised the Lord for work," writes Waldner in 1794, when the brotherhood already had become prosperous again in Russia.

So they journeyed on. "Moldavia as well as Wallachia is a good land," says Waldner, "Moldavia perhaps the better with its fresher air, its mountains and valleys, its streams and its springs, whereas Wallachia has great moors, and lacks water, though well-supplied with forest and meadow, field and pasture. And yet this good land was for the most part uninhabited and waste." The travelers finally came to the Polish border, where they had trouble with the border guard. Their food supply was exhausted and they still had a long road to travel. Then it turned out that the Russian army was encamped before Chotym. The commander was Count Peter Romjanzow, and the commander of Chotym

was General Weis. In their need the emigrants came to these men. Romjanzow proposed that they settle on his land in Little Russia and offered them a loan for their immediate needs. Who could have been happier than these people, yet first of all they demanded the privilege of free exercise of their religion and its requirements. The desired privileges were drawn up in a series of articles and handed to the count on the tenth of June. The very first article demanded religious freedom. Further, they were never to be required to appear in court or swear an oath. They were also to be granted freedom from military service and were to be permitted to live undisturbed in their community system according to the Hutterite model, and were to be free of taxes for three years. The count further promised that on their arrival in Wischenka, his domain, they should receive the necessary funds in advance for the construction of their dwellings, and would be assigned fields and meadows. They were to have freedom of trade and commerce, and in case they were not satisfied with the location they were to be permitted to emigrate after repayment of the funds advanced. After the three years freedom from taxes were past, they were to pay ground rent in cash. A list of the names of the group was to be given the count, with a notation of the trade which each one could follow. A guard of ten Cossacks with a captain was to escort them to Wischenka. The captain, a young German from Livonia, was ordered to provide them with food. When they arrived at a village at noon or evening, they were announced in advance and the village magistrate provided food. So they arrived at the Dnieper on July 19, ferried across at the Russian border, and rested two days in the city of Perejaslaw. On the first of August they reached Wischenka, which was to be their home.

Here they were quartered in two empty houses, so that their children and those who were sick might have shelter, and received daily a dish of flour for bread, peas, and other food which they needed. They were permitted to select their own building-plots. "It is the same place where we have now [1794] lived for 24 years." An engineer was furnished them to build the large house, in which dining-hall, kitchen, pantry, and carpenter shop was located. Everything was to be ready before winter. Clothing was furnished them by the village authorities in the form of fifty sheepskins which the furrier was to cut. Everything which they received from the count was carefully recorded and repaid

within a few years when they had been able to attain a slight prosperity.

> So we began to settle down with our spinning and weaving, and with the simplest household necessities, and although we had to suffer great privations during the first winter, we were content, happy, and grateful to God that once again we had a place where we could live together safely in peace and quiet.

While the emigrants were beginning anew in Russia the communal life according to the old traditional Hutterite pattern, supported and provided for by Count Romjanzow, who cared for them even when he was away, they were deeply concerned about the fate of their brethren who still lay in prisons in Siebenbuergen, and were anxious to inform them of their experiences in Wallachia and the emigration to Russia. When therefore an official of Count Romjanzow, who had come to Wischenka on a tour of inspection of the count's properties, was about to return to Wallachia, the brethren requested permission to send one of their number with him on the journey. Paul Glanzer was selected to visit the brethren and sisters who lay in prison in Siebenbuergen and to bring them, if possible, to Wischenka. Johannes Waldner gives a detailed report of this journey and its results. We learn that the officials in Hermannstadt had gradually improved the lot of the prisoners, and that the empress finally granted the release of all those who had been imprisoned for their faith, and permitted them to emigrate. This was glad news for the Carinthians who were in prison. Only two of the Anabaptists, those who were formerly from Alwinz, were excluded from the privileges, but even they finally succeeded in escaping the clutches of their old enemy, Delpini, and regained their liberty.

At the end of the year 1772 the little company of released prisoners set out on the journey to the new home in Russia. The party consisted of Matthias Hofer, a poet, dreamer, and grumbler, who had already spent sixteen years in prison, and almost the entire Glanzer family, Martin and Christian and their sisters Barbara, Maria, and Margaret, who had been held under examination five years in the city hall. The commanding general gave them a passport and permitted them to take their inheritance with them. They were given an escort to the border. Only three sisters remained in the land and they had married and accepted the Lutheran faith. The historian, Johannes Waldner, is quite agitated about them. He says, "They had little happiness and

joy, and suffered much, for they had a bad conscience all the time, and did not attend the Lutheran church, not even for the Lord's supper, and would much rather have come back to the brotherhood if they had been free." The others were brought to Wischenka at the expense of Count Romjanzow, where they arrived January 26, 1773, and rejoined the brotherhood. Already on July 27, 1771, the brotherhood had held the first preaching service in the newly-built house. On April 16, 1772, they celebrated "with great joy the blessed service in memory of our dear Lord and Saviour as a memorial of gratitude for his love and mercy," which had been omitted during the years 1770 and 1771 on account of the troublous times.

The time of peace had now come, although the further development was not always peaceful. As had been the case in Siebenbuergen, where the Anabaptists of one village did not always agree with those of the other villages in every point, so here there arose differences which were not always easily overcome. In these matters Johannes Waldner likewise relates the details, of which we wish to select but a few. There was for instance the above-mentioned Matthias Hofer, who in addition to his good qualities, also exerted an unwholesome influence in some respects. He was a zealous man,

> Who knew the Scriptures as thoroughly as the Lord's prayer, who could repeat the Psalms from memory as well as all the chapters of the Bible which contained prayers. In the beginning he rendered much service in establishing the brotherhood; he wrote about thirty hymns in prison; the brethren, above all the bishop, Hans Kleinsasser, followed his advice and counsel to a great extent; but in many respects he went too far, and was too strict, so that the brotherhood was repeatedly threatened with division. In accord with Psalm 134 he demanded prayer before and after midnight, and wished to have the prayers loud and in concert, not silent and in secret. He demanded that the authorities should not be greeted, that no work should be done for pay for an unbeliever since the unbeliever would profit from it, etc.

All these things naturally agitated the brotherhood so that they had no peace when he was present and finally had to request him to go elsewhere where he could be satisfied. The action was not exactly an expulsion since his agitation was not due to reprehensible motives, but rather a consequence of his excess of zeal. For instance, how could one possibly have forbidden the brethren and sisters to pray in secret. Finally it was decided to deal with him by following the custom of the old original Moravian broth-

...hoo' and consulting the brotherhood chronicle and Peter Riedemann's *Rechenschaft,* and if necessary to seek the will of the Lord by the lot.

For a long time the brotherhood was in great confusion, and Waldner states: "God protected us from a division. We searched diligently in the writings of the forefathers, especially in the brotherhood chronicle which the brotherhood had not possessed for a considerable time but had only recently received by a special providence of God from Alwinz." It happened that a widow who had also come from Carinthia by name Schneiweit, had a daughter who had married the son of the bishop of the congregation at Alwinz. The son had inherited the book on the death of his father and the book had been sold by the widow to the prisoners in Hermannstadt, who were held under examination in the city hall.

Waldner bitterly complains of the strife in the brotherhood.

> I would much rather pass over this in silence, and suffered much at the thought of having to hand down to our descendants the memory of our shortcomings, but I was compelled against my will to write the same, first because I did not dare to omit part and thus not write the truth in my history, just as the Bible records the unpraiseworthy as well as the praiseworthy deeds of the patriarchs, second because our experiences can be a warning to us and our descendants to observe how for such causes peace can be destroyed and many be led to say that community of goods and living together in common only produces quarrel and strife. If one examines the records of earlier times one will find that there was trouble [Unkraut] in those days also, even in the time of Jacob Hutter, and yet the Hutterites did not pass away, but came again to an agreement and prospered. In the third place, it may serve as a warning not to introduce new things into the brotherhood according to one's own fancy and thus modify the good old system of the brotherhood. The innovations are often due to clever dreamers who always claim to know and understand better than the others, as for instance our Matthias. However well he may have meant it, he went too far, for instance he could not stand singing at work.

In spite of the difficulties within, the outward prosperity of the brotherhood was not hindered. In the very first year the weaving industry brought a good profit, as did likewise the smithy. In the year 1776 a waterpower mill was built, and eleven years later a windmill. The council room where the elders held their meetings was built in 1776, likewise the ice and storage rooms. In 1778, the large and small schools were built, and in 1779 a meeting-house for worship. As Waldner states, "the Lord gave

them good years so that the brotherhood was soon quite prosperous in comparison with its previous poverty."

On October 16, 1779, Hans Kleinsasser died, the leader who had guided the brotherhood as bishop through eighteen years. Although he had many weaknesses, yet he had brought the brotherhood forward, "for he was a wise man, who understood how to conduct affairs." His successor was Joseph Müller, another of the Carinthian exiles of 1755. Since Matthias Hofer continued to make trouble and finally was designated by the majority as a "root of bitterness," who was only the cause of strife and ill-will, the entire brotherhood was glad when he voluntarily withdrew. We find him later on his travels among the Mennonites in West Prussia, Holland, and Germany, filled with secret longing for the brotherhood in Wischenka.

With great joy the Anabaptists of Hungary and Siebenbuergen received the news of the edict of toleration of 1781. The severely persecuted brethren could breathe again. All the pseudo-Catholics of the recent years discarded the disguise with which they had concealed their true belief to which they had remained faithful. Before long it was reported to the authorities that these people no longer fasted, were guilty of reading heretical books, would not attend Catholic services, and openly defended themselves on the basis of the freedom of religion guaranteed by the edict of toleration. One of the most zealous was Joseph Hörndl, a potter. In an official report he is charged with being the cause of all the "apostasy" in Sabatisch. It was said that he went from house to house with the edict calling out to people: "See the Emperor Joseph II does not desire to force our conscience. Read for yourself and consider the matter. If you are ready to stand with me, I am willing to be the first to go to the emperor." Concerning Hörndl we learn further that he sent letters to Wischenka inviting the brethren there to send representatives to aid them, and declaring that the pseudo-Catholics were ready to confess their true faith from which they had been driven by persecution and imprisonment. This was the sentiment not only in Sabatisch but also in Lewar and Trentschin, and even among the remnants of the Anabaptists in Siebenbuergen. How the brethren in Wischenka must have rejoiced over the turn of affairs.

The Carinthian exiles back in Wischenka who had suffered so severely in their native land for the sake of their faith, were no doubt quite surprised to learn of the about-face under Emperor Joseph II. It was a secretary of the Russian embassy in

Vienna who happened to visit Count Romjanzow who had brought the news, a certain Herr Klugfeld. Through this friendly gentleman the brethren sent letters to their friends and relatives in the former homeland, also to Hungary and Siebenbuergen, to learn how they were getting along, and also to give them an account of their own situation. They had the hope that there would be a new emigration from the old homeland since there were now no difficulties in the way. Joseph Kuhr still had children in Siebenbuergen and Johannes Stahl had two brothers in Hungary. Others likewise had relatives there.

Two brethren, Joseph Müller and Paul Glanzer,[6] were sent on the long journey to Hungary and Austria to investigate conditions first hand and to invite the friends to come to Wischenka. In Hungary the friends were completely surprised to learn that a congregation of the brethren was still in existence, for they supposed that all traces of the faith had been wiped out. In Carinthia the brethren were received with joy. Many still knew Paul Glanzer. But very little was accomplished, for, says Waldner,

> The truth and the pure teaching of the Gospel had become a strange thing to most of them, and they could not appreciate or understand that children should not be baptized, but only adults. They were afraid of the scoffing of their neighbors, since the name Anabaptist was still a symbol of arch-heresy, and the common man still supposes that there can be no worse heretic in the world than an Anabaptist. So it was even their closest friends refused to associate with them.

In Sabatisch the visit of the two brethren had created great agitation, but here as in Siebenbuergen they were not able to accomplish anything. Joseph Kuhr, the bishop and leader of the brotherhood wished at least to bring his children home with him. Later, in the spring of 1782 he and Elias Wipf went to Siebenbuergen, where he succeeded in securing two of his children, Andreas and Margaret, but the third, Michael Kuhr, had married a Hungarian woman and "could not free himself from material things." It is true that he promised to come the following year, but he failed to come, and died soon after in 1786.

Meanwhile the agitation in Sabatisch continued after the return of the two delegates. The Catholic clergy set themselves against the Anabaptist propaganda with full energy and suc-

---

[6] There is some confusion in the names of these delegates, or else later an additional two delegates were sent. Later one of the delegates is called "Brother Christian." —Editor.

ceeded in having the leaders of the movement arrested, who were ready to emigrate to Russia, namely Heinrich Schmidt, Jacob Walter, Jacob Müller, Paul Shotterli, Matthias Dangler, and Johannes Koller, and had them placed in a "dirty, stinking prison" in Neutra.

> When the others saw what they would have to suffer, they lost courage, and said to one another: "What good will it do us to remain steadfast and be exiled and leave our children behind to be ruined? Is it so sure that the brotherhood in Russia is a genuine Hutterite brotherhood?" So they decided to remain quiet in the hope that God would provide another means of escape, intending in the meanwhile to secure further information about the congregation in Russia.

A number however decided to appeal to the emperor. Was it not true that an edict of toleration had appeared according to which each one who had been forced to give up his faith was now permitted to return to his earlier belief? However they did not know that the toleration was only partial, and did not apply to the Anabaptists. Three delegates were sent to the emperor with the appeal. He received them says Waldner, and discoursed with them for three quarters of an hour inquiring what they did not approve in the Catholic faith. They mentioned infant baptism and the worship of images. "But what is wrong with infant baptism, and no one compels you to worship images. I am a Catholic myself and do not worship any images," said the emperor. They should remain like him in the Catholic faith, or accept one of the tolerated confessions, the Lutheran, the Calvinist, or the Greek Orthodox. Thereupon they replied that they were secure only so far as the confessions were concerned, and they wished to have a secure locality, such as Siebenbuergen or elsewhere, where they might settle. "That is all my land," replied the emperor, "and all one and the same thing." Thereupon they requested permission to emigrate to Russia. "What do you want in Russia," said the emperor. "There is no bread in Russia, and besides there you will have to accept the Orthodox faith." In this manner the emperor conversed with them until he finally said that they would either be tolerated or sent out of the land. Thereupon he ordered the prisoners in Neutra to be released, which was actually carried out, after they had been six weeks in prison.

They were all brought before three officials who tried hard to persuade them to become Catholics, and one after the other

consented. Only Jacob Walter remained steadfast. But even he was released. The others at Sabatisch all surrendered. According to Waldner, there was no spirit of courage in them, for they feared suffering and tribulation. They all were required to publicly renounce their faith, confess the Catholic articles of faith, swear on the rosary, etc. One of them said, it is true, that in his heart he could not acknowledge that it was right, but the others said nothing. When Jacob Walter saw how things stood at Sabatisch, he realized that he did not dare to be seen there again. Thereupon he bid good-by to his wife and child and set out for Russia. He journeyed by way of Prussian Silesia, came to Gnadenfrei to the Moravians and to Herrnhut in Saxony. Here he worked for a time with a potter. His master secured a passport for him from Count Zinzendorf (which is still in possession of the descendants of Walter) by means of which he was able to journey by way of Lemberg and Kiev and finally arrived on the twenty-second of December, 1782, in Wischenka.

Since the two delegates from Russia no longer found any response for their activity in Sabatisch, they wished at least to secure their inheritance in the old homeland, especially since they had the necessary documents in their possession. To this end they appealed to the Russian embassy, where they were aided by a "memorial" petition which they sent to the emperor. Four days later Brother Christian went to the palace (Hofburg) to inquire concerning the matter. It happened that the emperor was just entering his room when he saw Brother Christian, and at once invited him to enter. Christian then had a conversation of an half hour's length with the emperor. The emperor first asked what he wanted. Christian answered that they had sent a petition to him and did not know what had been done about it. The emperor inquired further whence they had come and whether they belonged to those who were in Hungary. Christian replied that in religion they belonged to that group, but that they were natives of Carinthia and belonged to the exiles who had been sent to Siebenbuergen in 1755. "I know, I know," said the emperor. Thereupon Christian asked whether he would not grant that their possessions be released which they had left behind. The emperor replied, "Come back to your fatherland and you shall receive your house and land, everything, again." The brother replied, "But we shall not be tolerated and shall have to suffer persecution." The emperor replied with earnest words, "Who persecutes, who persecutes, no one persecutes no—" Thereupon the brother re-

plied, "In this summer six men were imprisoned for their faith for more than a month." At this the emperor became quiet for a time. Finally he said, "But that is only a trifle, only a trifle. One must accept some religion, either Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist, or Greek Orthodox." The brother answered, "We do not see a right Christian life among them." Then the emperor answered, "Yes, but one can be pious and still live for himself as he desires." "No," answered the brother, "we cannot believe in our hearts anything else but that which Christ and his apostles have taught us, that one must hold fast to the true doctrine, be followers of Christ, and lead a godly life." The emperor inquired further what they were called, how it went with them in Siebenbuergen, whether they had had property there, whether the priest who had persecuted them was not Delpini, how the persecution was carried on, how they came to go to Wallachia, and how they prospered there, whether it was a good land, why they went to Russia, whether the count had given them enough land, how their houses were built, whether they had priests and whether their priests had wives.

All these questions Brother Christian answered truthfully. The emperor paid careful attention. Christian inquired repeatedly about the property which they had left behind, but the emperor answered neither yes nor no, and only asked how they were able to get out of Russia. Christian replied that Count Romjanzow had given them a passport to visit their friends in Germany (meaning the relatives in Siebenbuergen, Hungary, and Carinthia). So the conversation came to an end.

It was quite a while until the brethren received the reply concerning their possessions. They had to go back and forth to the various bureaus in Vienna, had to await word from Siebenbuergen as to the exact location of the property, etc. From there it was finally reported that the worth of the property was 2151 gulden, but no information was available concerning the location of the money. Finally the brethren decided to bid farewell to everything and return to the new home in Russia.

From this time on the brotherhood enjoyed a more peaceful development, not however without difficulties within, as mentioned above. The story of the further development is to be reserved for later publication.

A few words yet concerning Johannes Waldner, the Hutterite historian of whose existence we had not previously known. We learn the date of his birth from the continuation of the *Broth-*

erhood Chronicle where we find the following: "J. W. lived in the village of Neudorf with his second wife, Liesel, and her children, Joshua and Michael Hofer. He died on the 24th of September, 1824, aged 75 years." According to this he was born in 1749 and was 6 years old when he left his native land. That means that he experienced the severe persecution as a lad, the journey across the mountains into Wallachia as a youth, and finally the long journey to Russia. His reverence for the truth is repeatedly evidenced, for his account contains not only the favorable aspects but also the difficulties which the brotherhood experienced. Yet even where he finds it necessary to criticise he does so without personal rancor. Even for the stubborn Matthias Hofer he has a friendly word, and still more for Kleinsasser, although he criticises the dependence of the latter on Hofer. His attitude toward the writing of history is evident from various expressions throughout his narrative.

Author's Note

The significant facts revealed in the above article are:

1. Exact information concerning the decline and extinction of the Hutterite communities in Hungary and Siebenbürgen.

2. The discovery of the hitherto unknown activity of the Carinthian exiles in the resurrection of the brotherhood, including the three bishops which came from their number, namely, Hans Kleinsasser, Joseph Mueller, and Johannes Waldner. (Between Mueller and Waldner came Josef Kuhr of Alwinz.)

3. The discovery of a hitherto unknown but important historian in the person of Johannes Waldner.

4. The acquisition of a mass of hitherto unknown information in the narrative of Waldner, which we owe to the zeal of Elias Walter of Macleod, Alberta, Canada.

5. We therefore now possess a complete history of the Hutterite brotherhood from its beginning down to the present.

MENNO SIMONS ON THE INCARNATION

Irvin E. Burkhart

I

The scope of this discussion is limited to a study of the thought of Menno Simons concerning the incarnation of Jesus Christ in the light of the historical setting of that thought, with a view to determine the precise conception Menno held of the nature of the incarnation. This will necessitate a close examination of the text of his writings as well as the general views of the incarnation which he inherited. To the writer's knowledge there is no exhaustive interpretive treatment of this theme. However, a number of briefly stated opinions as to the meaning and significance of Menno's views have been formulated by historians. These are especially interesting because of the variations between the views and because of the fact that even the most sympathetic students of the man do not always agree in their testimony.

A. *A Decade of Controversy*

Before attempting an analysis of Menno's theory of the incarnation it will be necessary to make a brief survey of the leading debates on this question in which he engaged. It is rather clear that Menno was willing to debate his general doctrinal position, but that he did not intend to enter into controversy on the specific question of the incarnation. To all appearances he was drawn into this against his will. As it was, he ultimately had three outstanding controversies on this very question with the following men as opponents: John a'Lasco, Gellius Faber, and Martin Micron.

In his *Brief Complaint or Apology to all Theologians* Menno asked for the opportunity to debate ten points of doctrine, but he omitted the incarnation. The ten were those who are rightly called preachers, the unchangeableness of Christ's teaching, Christ's perfection, regeneration, faith and love, keeping God's commandments, baptism, the Lord's supper, the ban, Christian living.[1] To a'Lasco he wrote in 1544 saying, "you well know that you forced me against my will"[2] to debate the incarnation. Horsch says Martin Micron in his first debate with Menno complained concerning the omission of this point and insisted that it

be made a subject of discussion.[3] And when Menno closed his lengthy *Reply to Gellius Faber,* in which the incarnation was briefly treated, he said, "Here you have my forced reply to the indiscreet and blasphemous writing of Gellius which he published against the truth of God and His scattered church in A. D. 1552."[4] These references must suffice to show that he was "dogmatically interested"[5] in other subjects besides the incarnation.

The conditions which Menno laid down for these public discussions were, safe conduct for himself, the Word of God as the final authority, and sincere Christians as judges. Then Menno says, "If," under these conditions, "I cannot maintain my teaching . . . I will retract it and consign myself and my teachings to the fire."[6]

The first controversy was with John a'Lasco, who debated with Menno at Emden in 1544. He was a native of Poland and a Zwinglian by religion. He was called to the province of East Friesland by the Countess Anna, the regent, because the Roman state church had been discredited. There he was to superintend the organization of the new state church. At Emden, the capital of East Friesland, a'Lasco encountered a number of Menno's brethren who referred him to Menno Simons. The result was that a'Lasco invited Menno to come to Emden for an interview. With the consent of the ruler of the province and in the presence of a number of ministers and others a three days' discussion between Menno Simons and John a'Lasco was held in the Franciscan cloister at Emden, in January 1544. The subjects discussed by these two were, the calling of ministers, sanctification, original sin, baptism, and the incarnation. It should be remembered that Menno claimed that a'Lasco "forced me against my will" to discuss the incarnation. Whether or not this is true, as it probably is, the incarnation became one of the chief points of difference between the two. This is shown by Menno's *Brief and Clear Confession and Scriptural Demonstration* written to a'Lasco in 1544.[7]

The foregoing treatise was asked of Menno by a'Lasco when Menno left Emden after the debate mentioned above, and he agreed to write it. The incarnation was fully treated in this book and the chief point at issue was the flesh of Christ. Menno understood a'Lasco to say that "God could not suffer," and if Jesus was not of the earth or of Adam He could not have been a suffering Savior.[8] At any rate, the break was formally complete after this book was written. A'Lasco published a reply, and a-

gainst this answer Menno wrote his *Clear, Incontrovertible Confession and Demonstration,* in 1554.[9] In this book the incarnation was discussed at length. This shows that it had become almost the paramount issue between the two.

Another fact to be remembered in connection with the debates is that they were not given much publicity and that Menno did not consider them public discussions of the kind for which he had asked. Zwinglians were discountenanced by Luther, and for them publicly to debate with the Anabaptists would have been out of the question. Menno wrote in 1556 that "such a discussion has never been granted me," and in another connection, "it was impossible to obtain the desired discussion."[10]

A co-laborer with a'Lasco was one Herman Backereel. These two were in England from 1548 until 1553. They left the continent because the Smalcaldic league had been defeated by Charles V and Romanism was restored in the German provinces. They labored in London until the accession of the Catholic "bloody Mary" to the English throne, when they were exiled from England. After failing to be received in Denmark they sailed for northern Germany and landed at Wismar where they met Menno. Backereel debated with Menno but was vanquished due to lack of experience and of maturity. The debate was unimportant except that it was the occasion for the clash between Menno and Martin Micron later on. However, the incarnation was again the chief point at issue even though it was not the first question discussed.[11]

After the encounter of Backereel with Menno in 1553 an appeal for aid was sent by Backereel's group to Martin Micron, Zwinglian minister at Norden, East Friesland. Micron then came to Wismar in 1554 and had two conferences with Menno. On February 6, they discussed such questions as the incarnation, the oath, divorce, the calling of ministers, and the office of civil authority. The meeting lasted for eleven hours without intermission and ended with a common meal. On the fifteenth of the same month they met again and discussed the incarnation.[12] The cleavage between the two groups was wide indeed. Menno had understood a'Lasco to teach that "Christ partook of no other flesh than that which was subject to sin and death," and Micron further irritated this thought by insisting that "There were two sons in Christ, one the Son of God, the other the son of Mary. And also that the son of Mary who was crucified was not the Son of God."[13] Some time after the debate Micron wrote a report of it

and Menno claimed it was a one-sided report. The result was his *Reply to Martin Micron,* written in 1556.[14] Among other questions the incarnation was here given exhaustive treatment. This was the second controversy.

The third controversy was with Gellius Faber. In this case the writer does not know whether there were any personal debates. Nor does he know if Faber was Zwinglian or Lutheran. At this time he was a priest in Roman service and by retaining Roman forms could preach Protestant doctrine. Horsch[15] says he "frequently preached Lutheran doctrine from 1516 to 1536." Menno[16] quotes Luther to correct in Faber the error which he claimed that the Zwinglians, a'Lasco and Micron held, namely, that there are two persons in Christ. Luther said that in Christ, "God is man and man is God." Menno[17] said, "In Christ we have truly God and man, man and God." The fact of this agreement between Menno and Luther cannot be too strongly emphasized. It sheds great light upon the central point of Menno's debates on the incarnation. He fought as heresy any idea opposed to his view that there was one person, God, who became man. And this God in the form of man suffered for sin.

Faber was minister at Emden. He had written a book in 1552 warning the authorities against Menno Simons and his followers. Simons' reaction was the writing of his *Reply to a Publication of Gellius Faber*[18] during or before 1554. The subjects treated were, the calling of preachers, baptism, the true church of Christ, the Lord's supper, excommunication, and the incarnation. In this contest the incarnation was not so prominent. However, in the brief discussion given it the same charges appear as against a'Lasco and Micron, namely, that Faber divides Christ into two persons, and that he makes Him sinful by insisting that His humanity was identical with that of Mary.[19]

The period from 1544 to 1554 might be called the decade of controversy over the incarnation. We have noticed the meeting with John a'Lasco in 1544, at Emden; the meeting with Herman Backereel at Wismar in 1553; the encounter with Martin Micron, also at Wismar, in 1554; the written *Reply to Gellius Faber* in 1554, also the *Clear, Incontrovertible Confession and Demonstration* written to a'Lasco in 1554. As was said before, Menno did not consider these debates real public discussions. Toward the close of his life he seems to have wearied of the hope that debates would avail in settling the doctrinal convictions of men, especially if a change of opinion involved a lucra-

tive position of power. Note the almost chagrinned conclusion of the *Reply to Martin Micron*:

> Nor shall I hereafter solicit a public discussion with any person, and that for this reason, first: because I have these many years desired it by numerous written and verbal requests, and have never been granted it. From which it is manifest that they care but little for the glory of God and the souls of men.
>
> John a'Lasco, Calvin, and Theodore Beza . . . are men of Secondly, because your principal teachers and exemplary men as blood. That this is the case is testified by their own books, as also by Seructus (Servetus) of Geneva, and Joris of Pariss who was burned with four others in England.
>
> I will let Babylon be Babylon with its false preachers, impure doctrine, idolatrous baptism and supper, together with its false religion, impenitent, vain, easy life. I will, with holy Habakkuk, stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and thus clearly sound the trumpet of the holy, divine Word.[20]

B. *Opinions of Students Concerning Menno Simons' View of the Incarnation*

From the controversies over the incarnation we turn to a variable group of opinions expressed by students of Menno Simons concerning his view on this point of doctrine. We shall follow them more or less chronologically rather than under the captions of favorable and unfavorable.

John Lawrence Mosheim in his *Institutionum Historiae Ecclesiasticae* gives Menno Simons and the Mennonites a rather brief but nevertheless interesting treatment. It cannot be said that he is unfair, yet it does not seem that he has thoroughly mastered Menno's thought. On the point of the incarnation he quotes Herman Schyn as follows:

> Menno denied that Christ received from the Virgin Mary that human body which he assumed. On the contrary, he supposed it was produced out of nothing in the womb of the immaculate virgin, but the power of the Holy Ghost.[21]

Mosheim specifically says that this is the statement of Menno's view by Herman Schyn[22], and that after examining *some* of Menno's writings he is inclined to think it a probable explanation, but that others have reported it differently. Also that he thinks Menno gave up this opinion but was in doubt as to what other opinion he should accept as a substitute. Menno, himself said he had held this view over a period of many years, and that he never changed his opinion about it.[23]

Simeon Frederick Rues, in his *Tegenwoordige Staet der Doopsegezinden of Mennoniten,* gave some attention to the followers of Menno Simons and also to Menno. It was his opinion that Menno's view of the incarnation was held by the Fleming[24] Mennonites, but not by the Waterlanders. The Flemings, he said, held the following position on the incarnation:

> The human nature of Christ which from the very beginning of the Incarnation God created out of nothing in the womb of the holy virgin, received its sustenance from the blood of the mother virgin. . . . Menno came to this viewpoint because he could not understand how the human nature of Christ could be without sin if one believed that it originated with Mary.[25]

We shall see in the later discussion that Menno specifically denied that the flesh of Christ was created. He accounted for it by supernatural means but not by creation.[26]

In the case of S. Cramer, Professor at Amsterdam, Holland, and one of the editors of the *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica,* we come to within a generation of our present day. Dr. Cramer seems to have been slightly impatient with the lack of clarity in the philosophical implications of Menno's thought. Referring to Anabaptist teachings, he said:

> A being, which was God and man at once, appeared inexplicable to them. They found it far more intelligible that the pre-existing Christ at the conception was changed into a man.[27]

Cramer also charged Menno with inconsistency in explaining the two natures. He says Menno did not accept the view that Christ was both God and man.[28] The writer feels convinced that Menno intended to teach that the "Christ was not changed into a man", but that He "became Man", and was at the same time also God.[29]

In *The Dutch Anabaptists,* by Henry Elias Dosker, who was for many years Professor in the Southern Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Louisville, Kentucky, we come to a number of expressions that may rightly be challenged on the ground that they were not derived from a careful study of a reliable edition of Menno's writings, or else are due to the fact that the attitude of the author was unsympathetic.[30] He says, "Menno is not a clear thinker, and his theological views are hazy." One might reply that Menno did not claim to be a theologian but an apostle of piety. Even then, however, his opinions on original sin, the sacraments, ordinances, and other points are clear beyond all dispute. To judge him as a hazy thinker by his view on the incarnation would be to bring the same verdict against all theologians,

because, an incarnation cannot be rationally defined under any circumstances.

Dosker quotes Mosheim approvingly as holding the following opinion: "Menno supposed it (the body of Christ) was produced out of nothing." We have shown that Mosheim said this was the view of Schyn, and after he (Mosheim) had examined some of Menno's writings he concluded this was probably the best explanation but that Menno's view admitted of other interpretations. Further, in this same connection, Dosker approves the attitude of Adam Pastor, saying that he "exposes Menno's lack of logic by drawing a lurid picture of the creator becoming a creature." All this when a sympathetic study of Menno's writings would have shown Menno unmistakably clear on this very point. Menno said:

> (The idea) that Christ had a beginning like another creature is an opinion which all true Christians look upon as a terrible curse, blasphemy, and abomination.[31]

Dosker also endeavored to show a contradiction by quoting one passage in which Menno said Christ was the fruit of Mary's body and she his natural mother which he sets over against another passage which says Christ had "neither father nor mother in the sense that He should have become man from human seed." This is clearly a contradiction if it comprehends the thought of both passages. But the first treats of Christ's human relationship, the second of human origin. Menno affirmed the first and denied the second. Dosker also quotes the same passage quoted by Alenson who endeavored to trap Menno with the affirmation that Christ was changed into man and then later denied the assertion. This alleged contradiction will be fully discussed later.[32] Suffice it to say at this point that these contradictions mentioned by Alenson and Vos seem to be attempts on the part of these writers to apply every aspect of Menno's discussions to one specific point without regard to the involved context.

K. Vos[33] holds that Menno's view arose out of a misunderstanding of the natural process of reproduction. It is probably true that Menno stressed too much the sinfulness of the flesh *per se*. But Vos cannot be credited as fully correct when he implies that Menno was confused in his own mind on this question, and that he built his theory on a wrong doctrinal basis.

Horsch[34] understood Menno to teach that God through the Holy Spirit prepared a body for Christ, and yet that Mary was

truly His mother; that though He was human He was also divine; that the human and divine were not two different parts of the Christ, but that He was undivided. This statement is close to a thoughtful and comprehensive statement of Menno's view.

Langenwalter,[35] seems to think Menno taught that Christ's body was created. He also says (though very sympathetically) that Menno was so zealous in defending his view that he contradicted himself in his argument, at one time denying Mary any vital part in the incarnation and later insisting that she played the part of a real mother. He thinks, however, that this should not be held against Menno because he did not strive primarily to be a theologian but a preacher of righteousness in troubled and tempestuous times. This is kindly put to say the least.

These testimonies are various indeed. Some of the writers are patently hostile, others sympathetically unfavorable, and yet others feel that Menno was clear in his view and ably explained it. Neal[36] is unworried about it all. He thinks it is "a scholastic distinction incapable of doing much mischief." Vedder[37] likewise, passes it by with a gesture as, "the harmless error of an untrained mind."

The next chapter will be an exposition of Menno's theory and the writer's viewpoint will appear there.

II

In the preceding sections an attempt has been made to show how Menno's controversies and the opinions of later interpreters have given his view of the incarnation a historical significance. The next task is to deduce Menno's view of the incarnation from his writings. This is necessary because in the following chapter it is planned to compare Menno's view with the views of other individuals and groups who preceded, were contemporary with, and followed Menno. A clear presentation of his view will eliminate many possibilities of misunderstanding.

A. *The Human Lineage of Jesus*

The storm center in the debates in which Simons participated had a tendency to gravitate toward the question of the humanity of Jesus. Gellius Faber was of the opinion that Menno had such a view of Christ as made Him neither "God nor man". Faber's opinion was that "the Son of God took His human nature from our flesh . . . and that the man Christ Jesus died, but

the Word remained entirely unwounded."[38] This was exceedingly objectionable to Menno because he claimed it meant the forsaking of the "true Son of the living God", and would make us accept "an earthly creature of Adam's unclean and sinful flesh as being our Saviour".[39] This he said robs us of our Christ and robs Him of His most holy origin, glory, honor, and person, and renders Him a divided, impure, and inconsistent Christ, both according to nature and the Scriptures. It seems the heart of Menno's objection was that his opponents said that God did not suffer for our sins, but only the man Christ. Menno would have no Christ at all if he could not have God suffering in the flesh for the sins of man.

Menno understood that the intention of a'Lasco was to prove that Christ was "the seed of Abraham" according to flesh and blood. His proof text was Hebrews 2:16, "He took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham." But Menno held that it could not be Abraham's natural flesh and blood because the Word became flesh and was begotten of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, Christ is the seed of Abraham as regards the promise, "all men should be blessed in Him." Therefore, since Mary is of the lineage of Abraham she mothers a son who is Abraham's seed, but not natural seed because this seed is begotten of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 1:25). The further fact that "as the children are partakers of flesh and blood He also Himself partook of the same" (Heb. 2:14), Simons says, is a reference to mortality rather than to actual flesh and blood.[40] His point of contention was that Christ was seed of Abraham as pertained to the mortal limits of man rather than to the identical substance of their flesh and blood.

The same line of argument is followed in explaining how Christ was the "seed of David". The opposition taught that Jesus was of the loins of David according to the flesh, and according to the spirit alone born of God. He admits that "in the common course of nature" this might seem reasonable, but that it does not bear the test of the Scriptures which say that "the Word became flesh" (John 1:14), and "came forth from the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 1:20).[41] He says:

> This Word, conceived and brought forth of the Holy Spirit, became flesh in Mary; and, according to this same flesh which had its origin and descent from the Holy Spirit He was born of Mary, the pure virgin, who was of the lineage and seed of David. This David was of Judah, Judah of Jacob, Jacob of Isaac, and Isaac of Abraham. Thus the divine promise was fulfilled.[42]

This same conclusion applies to the "seed of David" as applied to the "seed of Abraham", namely, that it refers to mortality and its associate characteristics and not to identity of substance, flesh and blood.

The attempt to explain how Christ was the seed of woman" (Gen. 3:15) seems fraught with greater difficulties than the former two, though an explanation is not wanting. He says He became flesh "in Mary, not of Mary". On the surface this would appear as if he meant Mary was merely an impassive and non-participating instrument in whom God created flesh, but it is questionable whether Menno desired to go this far. In fact, it seems quite clear that he did not. He says that even if Jesus was "conceived and begotten" of the Holy Spirit He was:

> preserved alive[43] and nourished[44] in Mary as a natural child is by its mother, and born of her a true Son of God, and a true Son of man, truly flesh and blood, needy, hungry, thirsty, suffering, mortal according to flesh, immortal according to the spirit, like us in everything except that he did not partake of sin (Heb. 2:9).[45]

To explain further this point pertaining to the "seed of woman" and the "fruit of the womb" Menno has two illustrations, one from the fruit of the field, the other the fruit of a tree. An opponent had urged that Jesus was the "fruit of Mary's womb as an apple is called the fruit of a tree because it grows upon the tree and partakes of its nature." But Menno turns this illustration back upon him to prove his own point and says that, an apple is called the fruit of the tree, but is actually produced by the soil on which the tree is grown. His point seems to be that even though the tree performs an integral function the apple is the result of another factor, the soil. So the fruit of the womb of Mary was the product of the Holy Spirit through the vital mediation of Mary.[46]

In the illustration from the field he lays out the parts: The prepared field, the seed wheat, the sower, and the resulting crop which is called the fruit of the field. The fruit could not have been produced by the field alone (Mary). The seed (Christ) could not have become the fruit until the sower (Holy Spirit) performed his part of the planting. Then when the fruit (Son of man) was produced, even though the field (Mary) produced it, it was not at all the same kind of substance as the field, neither did it have its origin in the field, and yet, it was a true fruit thereof. So the origin of the Son of man is divine, the growth to man is a normal human process, the result is a man like other

man as to need, hunger, thirst, suffering, mortality, and spiritual immortality, but the flesh and blood substance was not identical with that of man because it was the result of a divine seed within human limits.[46]

This seems to be an attempt to distinguish between origin and sustenance. He says "seed of woman" can have no biological significance as to the origin of her seed. When his opponents said the son of woman suffered he replied that a son was impossible without a male origin. He says if the woman's transmission were reckoned Christ would be as much Syrian or Moabite as Hebrew because there were Syrian and Moabite strains in the human lineage. But the male succession is reckoned because of the origin. To prove this he quoted I Cor. 11:8, "Man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man, and the man is by the woman." He seems sure of his ground and it appears he is insisting that the inner-personality-stuff of Jesus was of the Father, and that this substance (or being) was not originated but sustained by Mary. He also wishes to insist that nourishment cannot make impure according to Christ's own words. He said it is not what enters into man that defiles but what proceedeth from within (Matt. 15:11).[47]

This naturally raises the question as to Menno's theory concerning the person of Mary. His references to her purity lead one to inquire if he held to the old Roman view of Mary's sinlessness. In his teaching on faith he exhorts his readers to reflect upon the "faith of the unspotted[48], glorious mother Mary".[49] At another time he impersonates Christ and makes Him say: "I was born of Mary the spotless[48] virgin. I am the firstborn of every creature, the first and the last, the beginning and the end, the Son of almighty God."[50] Yet a third time he uses the same word when he writes: "In the fulness of time, through the power of the Holy Spirit, He became, in the womb of the unspotted[48] virgin, Mary, real flesh and blood, a visible, tangible, and mortal man."[51]

A new word appears in the discussion of the lineage question. Speaking of the work of the Holy Spirit and the process of becoming flesh, he says, Jesus "was born of Mary, the pure[52] virgin, according to the flesh which had its origin and descent from the Holy Spirit."[53] Along with these references to spotlessness and purity appears the following: "We do not read in all the Scriptures that Mary, who was a natural daughter of Adam's

impure and sinful seed, was without sin[54] and pure[55], as Micron during the debates confessed before all of us."[56]

It scarcely seems reasonable to suggest a contradiction on this point even if the phrases "unspotted, pure virgin", and "sinful, impure Mary", do appear. Not one of the passages cited occurs in discussion of original sin but the last one. All the others seem to be (though Menno does not expressly say so) references to the integrity of Mary and not to her state as sinner. Not one of the words used refers to a state of original sin except the phrase "without sin"[54], and it is used to deny that she was without sin. It seems reasonable to conclude that Mary was considered by Menno as originally sinful and an object of mercy the same as he considered all others. On this point he held that man was unqualifiedly sinful from birth.

It appears that the crux of his problem was whether God suffered in the crucifixion, or whether it was only man. He probably would never have disputed the subject if Faber, a'Lasco, Micron, and others had not intimated so strongly that being born of Mary implied everything that the birth of any child would imply, especially so as to sin. Menno understood them to mean that the connection of the human mother guaranteed a sinful offspring, and this was most objectionable to him. The reason for this arises out of his theory of universal and total depravity occasioned by the fall of the first parents of the race.[57] That Menno was not chiefly concerned with the vindication of his view pertaining to the point of Christ's becoming flesh is further proved by the fact that he does not attack Luther and Calvin on their views of the incarnation.

The basis of brotherhood as discussed by Menno further illuminates his viewpoint. He understood the teaching of Micron on Heb. 2:11-17 to mean that Christ is our brother because He took upon Himself our flesh or, in other words, that the basis of brotherhood is the flesh. He then says that the passage means that Christ did not partake of the flesh and blood of children, but simply flesh and blood. The phrase, "the sanctified and the sanctifier are one," (2:11), was also disputed. The opponents said it referred to Adam, to which Menno replied that then all thieves, murderers, and rogues were Christ's brethren—if the basis of brotherhood is in Adam. He further maintains that "if we are Christ's brethren on account of the flesh, then we would also be His children on account of the flesh." This is clearly a reference to Heb. 2:13, "Behold, I and the children whom God

has given me." And now, he says, if we are Christ's brethren and children according to the flesh, it would logically follow that "one brother was the seat of life for another, and a child of the father," because many born previous to Christ became His children. Therefore he concludes:

> Paul does not say that the unsanctified . . . children of the devil are one with Christ, (due to a oneness of the flesh)[58], but that the sanctified, who with Him are born of God, are one with Him. On account of this birth of God, (not on account of flesh birth of Adam), we are His brethren. (These then have one Father because) as He is the first born Son of God, (Heb. 1:6), He is also the first born among many brethren (Rom. 8:29).[59]

And so the children and brethren are not children and brethren because of the flesh but because of the spirit. If it is not so he claims the Scripture (Heb. 2:13) referring to children would have to be understood spiritually, and the one (Heb. 2:11) referring to brethren would have to be interpreted naturally. To him this would be a contradiction to say the least.[60]

B. *The Question of the Natures of Christ*

Turning from the incarnation proper to the kindred subject of the natures of Christ, it is necessary to explain what Menno wrote concerning this question. It has been charged that he taught a change in the divine nature of Christ and denied that He was both God and man after the change.[61] That this point of the change made by Christ is intricate and difficult need not be argued, but what was meant by the change Menno referred to seems fairly clear from his writings.

In his *Reply to Martin Micron,* Menno refers to a'Lasco's antithesis of Philippians 2:7 as resulting in a dual person with divine form and nature co-incident with human form and nature. A'Lasco said, "Jesus was in the form of God, and in the form of a servant, but the sins on account of which we are called servants in Scripture, He did not have."[62] Menno disclaimed the accuracy of this by saying that Christ was in the Godly form and thereby truly God, and that He humbled Himself (as God) and took the form[63] of a servant "because He desired to serve."[64] This servant form, however, he seems to refer to function rather than to form or substance of His body. It seems to come back to the old question whether or not to be truly human in function Jesus had to be truly human in substance. He does not seem to think this nec-

essary, for he says, Christ would "fulfil the law in His innocent flesh and not in our guilty flesh."[65]

Commenting further on a'Lasco's antithesis, Menno says, if Jesus was of divine form and nature, also at the same time of human form and nature, it follows that one of two things is true, namely, either Christ was sinner or else He was not God. This is so because, if He had the sinful form (substance or status) and not the sin, as a'Lasco says, He would also have had the divine form (substance or status) but not the divine spirit. But it is obvious if He had the divine form He must have had the divine spirit, and upon this it logically follows if He had the sinful form He must also have had the sin. The true antithesis, he holds, would be that Christ was in the Godly form, hence truly God, but that He limited His Godly form by the form of a servant because He wanted to serve. Thus He was truly God in God, and became truly man as servant. In other words, He changed (or limited) His divine form (not nature) by union with the human. The real human import of it all is that He was human in function but not in substance, that He was called servant because He wanted to serve, not because His flesh was identical in substance with ours.[66]

We must not, however, get the impression that Menno means to convey the idea that the deity was absent in this human form. This idea appears on the surface but will not stand the test of his frequent references to a "true Son of God and a true Son of man". Nor should we stress too literally the meaning of the word "change". It comes up in connection with the alleged contradiction to be discussed later. At most it is an explanatory term used to get at the idea of "became", the verb which occurs in Menno's basic proof text, John 1:14.

The references to the natures are somewhat more clear. He grants that there are two natures, but is careful to distinguish between the nature and the being. Menno gleaned from his opponents that two natures, divine and human, imply two persons. This he artfully refutes in one of his very few philosophic references[67];

> If one sees a man he does not say, that is a human nature, but that is a human being; for the characteristic[68] is not the being[69] itself, but the being possesses the characteristic. And if Christ had but the characteristics, namely, the natures[70], and if He had not the being itself, which is the substances,[71] then He was neither God nor man. For the natures are not the being itself, but the being possesses the natures.[72]

Pushing his point still further he says:

> If there are two natures[70] in one Christian, then why not in Christ? . . . . Being of no other origin but of God, He must also have the nature of the one from whom He is . . . . That He had this divine nature He proved by His perfect righteousness, truth, holiness, love, and mighty works . . . But He also had the undefiled and pure human nature[70] (such as Adam's nature before the fall). This is so because of His true human being[69]. . . and, as He thus became a true human being, He must also have had the true human nature that pertains to a true human, or else He would not have been a true man.[73]

We are here in the midst of statements which are logically clear, but which are not necessarily adequate definitions of the terms. It does seem, however, that his intention cannot be mistaken. The divine being has become human, had undergone "change", but the nature or characteristics of this same divine being are unchanged and present in the human being. God and man have become one person. The divine nature[68] is present and manifests itself in perfect righteousness, love and power, but the divine being[69] is now become man. The human nature is present and manifests itself in need, hunger, suffering, and mortality. In short, there are two natures, but only one being or person.

Another aspect closely related to the question of the natures is that of the endurance of suffering. English translators are wont to say passive[74] and impassive[75], meaning the suffering and non-suffering. Menno understood Micron's position as follows: "There are two sons in Christ. The one eternal and impassive; the other temporal and passive; and that the one which suffered for us was not the Son of God."[76] He stoutly denied that Christ is impassive and immortal as God, but that He is passive and mortal as man. He maintains that God Himself is impassive and immortal, but that Christ became passive and mortal, hence He was not also at the same time impassive and immortal. As proof he cites John 17:5 which portrays Jesus as praying to receive again the glory which He had lost in becoming man. Now, says Menno, if He remained unchanged in His Godlike station (status) and suffered only with what He had taken on from Mary, then what had He lost, and what need had He to pray to the Father to restore again that which He had not lost?[77]

He does not consider the fulcrum properly placed until the weights of the lost glory and suffering deity each have a place on the far end of the balance with man's sin and guilt on the other extreme. These could not be outweighed by the passive Christ if

He suffers only as man for whom He gave His life. If God did not suffer, he says, then they have "robbed us of our Messiah". When the suffering (as God became flesh) is over then, and then only, does He seek to regain the lost glory and become again the impassive and immortal one. It is clear that he did not consider "glory" as a matter of location but as a matter of personality and personal relationships.

The sin question is quickly answered. Christ's becoming flesh and humanly limited in Mary made Him in all things like His "sanctified brethren", sin excepted. This made it possible for Him to fulfil the law "in His innocent flesh"[78] and not in our guilty flesh. How else could He take away the deserved death but by His innocent death? Here it is necessary to raise the question as to Menno's conception of the flesh *per se*. Does he mean that the original sin, of which he wrote so much is basically related to the flesh *per se?* Is it a matter of inheritance or of volition? It seems clear that to Menno it is a problem of heredity. He teaches that no one is excepted from the effects of Adam's sin, nor is Mary an exception to the rule:

> As Mary was of the sinful seed of Adam, as we are, she, therefore, was concluded under sin the same as we, for the Scriptures except none of Adam's seed . . . whereby it is plainly shown that He is not of Mary's flesh . . . but that the Father's most glorious Word which knew not sin became flesh.[79]

On the same point he said he appealed to the Scriptures, only to find that:

> We do not read in the Scriptures that such pure, innocent, spotless and blessed fruit as was Christ Jesus, was born of such impure, sinful flesh, guilty of death, as was the flesh of Mary, since she was a daughter of the impure seed of Adam.[80]

In yet another reference Menno endeavors to distinguish between his viewpoint and that of a'Lasco, Micron, and Faber. He says:

> They (our opponents) say and teach, without any Scripture, that the Word has put on a whole man of Mary's flesh and seed; and we say and teach, according to the plain testimony of John, that the Word was made flesh, not of Mary, but in Mary.[81]

This puts one well on the way to a reasonable understanding of the tenacious insistence that the flesh of Jesus could not have been of the same substance as that of Mary. That this is logical cannot be denied. Whether one would agree with him or not would depend on whether or not one held to the inherently evil nature of

the flesh *per se*. The question of sin is clear from the standpoint of the flesh, but whether or not Menno thought Jesus could sin if He desired to do so is not so clear. A previous citation[73] said He had a nature such as Adam before the fall. In that event, He like Adam could have chosen to sin.

C. *Christ's Relation to the Trinity in the Incarnation*

The relation of the Incarnate Son to the Trinity was not debated by Menno as was that of the humanity and the natures. Menno did not discuss it from the angle of the incarnation, but did treat it sufficiently to prove that it caught his attention. Some interpreters since then have said that he did not teach the personality of the Holy Spirit, and that he was Socinian in this respect.[82]

There may have been some erroneous tendencies among some of the Anabaptists because Calvin said, "When they boast extravagantly of the Spirit, the tendency certainly is to sink and bury the Word of God."[83] This cannot have referred to Menno and the Dutch Mennonites, for it might be said that Menno's refrain throughout his writings is an almost ultra-insistence upon the Scriptures as the acid test of all revelation, and the Holy Spirit as the teacher of Scripture. The Lutherans in the Augsburg Confession, in their attempt to neutralize Roman censure, condemned the Anabaptists for teaching that "the Holy Spirit came apart from the outward Word."[84] This was an unconscious tribute to the Anabaptists and would indeed be true of Menno, but he never taught the Spirit's separation from the other persons of the Trinity. Neither did he characterize Him merely as an influence.

The relation of the Son to the Trinity comes out very clearly in the discussion of the Godhead. He says:

> We believe and confess before God, before His angels, before all our brethren, before all the world, that these three names, influences, and powers, namely, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (which the Fathers called three persons, and by which they meant three true, divine beings)[85] are one incomprehensible, indescribable, almighty, holy, only, eternal and sovereign God, as John says, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one.[86]

In this passage one cannot mistake the emphasis upon three persons on a basis of equality and unity. Nor should we overlook the point that these three, Father, Son, and Spirit, constituted, in Menno's theism, "one sovereign God". It might easily be interpreted as the modern view held by representatives of English[87]

and American[88] religious thought. These make God, not a unit but, a unity of manifold conditions within Himself. The "transcendent God" related to the immanent God is the Father. The "objectively immanent God" is the Word which discloses the inmost secret of God's life as holy love in the incarnate Son. The "subjectively immanent God" is the Holy Spirit imparting life, cleansing, and truth to the soul of man. Not three Gods (tritheism), but three personal conditions within one God. True enough, Menno did not state his position so clearly. But he does seem to have definitely laid the necessary groundwork upon which this final view could be built.

In another pertinent passage on the Holy Spirit, the relation of the Son appears in another light:

> We believe and confess the Holy Spirit to be a true, real, or personal Holy Spirit, and this in a divine sense—even as the Father is a true Father, and Son is a true Son; which Holy Spirit is incomprehensible, inexpressible, and indescribable for all mankind as we have also testified concerning the Father and the Son. He is divine with his divine gifts,[89] proceeding from the Father through the Son, although he ever remains with God and in God and is never separated in his being[90] from the Father and the Son.[91]

Kuhler[92], quotes from Van Ceulen's Socinian writing a sentence which includes a phrase almost identical with the above, "proceeding from the Father through the Son". His point seems to be that Van Ceulen makes the Spirit a power or influence that proceeds from the Father through the Son, and that his view has its basis in Menno's writing. But this omits the very distinction that Menno was trying to make. He says expressly that He is "an existing personal Holy Spirit", while the other says "the Holy Spirit is an influence (power) of God."[92] Menno is always clear in his emphasis upon the personal. When he makes the Spirit "proceed through the Son" he is referring to John's writing where he quotes Jesus as saying He would "send another Comforter, even the Spirit of truth." That this is an influence which the Son sends out seems far from Menno's thought. He says "this being is never separated" from the other two persons of the Godhead.

The relation of the human Christ to the Father was never disputed, and is mentioned in almost every pertinent reference to the incarnation. Menno understood the claim of Christ to be that He was the Son of God. He says, "Christ Himself had to suffer death because He claimed He was the Son of God."[93] He also said the Son was pre-existent and uncreated: "The Father

was from eternity and will eternally remain . . . . His Word, Christ Jesus, has from eternity been with Him . . . or else we should have to confess that . . . He has had a beginning like a creature, an opinion upon which all true Christians look as a terrible curse, blasphemy, and abomination."[94] He further held that the careful observation of the Galilean led him "to believe and confess Jesus Christ to be truly God with His Father because of the divine glory, works, and attributes, which are found in such abundance with Him."[94] Nor did he hold to any evolutionary concept as to the relation of the Christ to God. His Christ did not progressively attain Sonship, but was the Son from the beginning who was "sent and given unto us out of pure mercy and grace, from the Father . . . . Through Him all the believing have liberty, peace, life eternal, a reconciled Father, and free access to God in the Spirit."[95]

D. *Definition of Menno's View of the Incarnation*

In our attempt to define Menno's view we come first to the question: Can the human intellect comprehend the incarnation? This question gave Menno no end of trouble and misgiving. He frequently uses the words "incomprehensible", "indescribable", "unfathomable", and "inexpressible". Horsch makes the singular remark that, "In his answers to the attacks of his opponents Menno sometimes apparently lost sight of the principle stated by himself, namely, that the incarnation of Christ is not to be comprehended but believed."[96] It might be added that he did consistently urge in all replies to opponents that they shall not make reason the final test, but that they should return to the Scriptures for finality. He would say to an opponent that his conclusion "sounds good according to the course of nature, but not so according to the witness of the Scriptures". And again, "You say God cannot suffer, but the Scriptures say otherwise." This standpoint he held all his life in the most sustained manner. He does seem to have overlooked the relation of his own principle of "private interpretation" and the finality of reason, namely, that when one would read the Scriptures and decide upon their testimony and validity for life, the decision then is made by reason. In this sense, namely, that of pronouncing valid, the reason is final.

To Menno the voice of the prophets, evangelists, and apostles was the truth. To him "they testify with invincible power to the ineffable divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ." He

says he has "no doubt in the least that a pious, humble, God-fearing conscience will herewith be satisfied, and will not search into the incomprehensible mystery any further." If anyone desires "to search and dispute further", Menno says, he may do so all his life and will yet never have "a settled mind nor a firm foundation". If anyone insists on going further than "the testimony from the Word of God, he will fall into error". For this reason "I wish that all the brethren were of like mind with me in this respect (of referring all to the test of the Scriptures); for I have been at enmity with human sophistry . . . for fifteen years, and expect to remain so."[97]

He seems to have held in high regard the probability of divine power being manifested in miracle, and that a denial of this was a denial of the power of God. When he wrote the *Confutation* for a'Lasco he attempted to prove that the body of Christ was not given by Mary. He then anticipated the question to come from his opponent, whence the body would have come. To this he replies with the counter question (a method frequently used by him): "Whence came the water which flowed from the hard rock? Was it not accomplished above all human understanding and comprehension through God's almighty power, to which nothing is impossible?"[98] It also seems that he wearied of the debates and discussions because he felt they were not getting anywhere. In no case did he suggest a retreat. He fought to the last ditch, was always polite to his opponents, and always answered every question that was projected. He complains that "they would use philosophy and not the Scriptures." For that reason he "wished the ineffable mystery were left with God."

Another point worthy of note on the problem of rational comprehension is that Menno's attitude would not permit the old head-in-the-sand theory held by the Roman church of that period. He would heartily agree with such an one as Thomas a'Kempis that "it is a great matter to live in obedience to a superior." To a'Kempis, that superior spoke only through the church, but to Menno he spoke direct. A'Kempis said, "One ought to beware of curious and unprofitable searching into this most profound sacrament . . . Humble inquiry after the truth is allowable, provided we be always ready to be taught . . . in the sound doctrine of the church." Now while Menno was extremely cautious in accepting philosophical interpretations of the Scriptures he had come a long way past a'Kempis when he said, "I do not intend to encumber the service of God with something besetting

for which I have no Scriptural grounds. I can neither teach nor live by the faith of others. I must live by my own faith, as the Spirit of the Lord has taught me through His word."[99]

Coming more specifically to the definitive aspect of this view, it seems clear that Menno held that the process of incarnation should not be called a creation but a miracle. Horsch understood Menno to hold that for anyone "to assert that Christ was, in that case, not truly human was to deny the omnipotence of God."[101] There is no question as to Menno's adherence to the probability of miracles or supernatural manifestations. The particular point to note here is that Menno attempts a careful distinction between creation and miracle. His opponents gathered from his teaching that there must have been a new creation if the Word became flesh and did not partake of Mary's flesh. He replies:

> If all miracles and powers of God, by which many things were changed into different beings or forms from what they were before, were to be called a new creation, then we would find many such new creations in the Scriptures, as when the water was turned into blood, (Ex. 7:20), and when the water was changed into wine, (John 2:9) . . . . The omnipotence of God was thereby acknowledged, yet it is not called a new creation in the Scriptures.[102]

This very pertinent passage will bear a close analysis. The question of the change that occurs in miracle is clearly raised. He seems to mean a new synthesis of previously existing elements. He then intimates that such was the case at the marriage feast. The making of wine he would explain as a new combination of existing elements. The same with the water turned into blood in the Exodus story. Also thus with Lot's wife in becoming a pillar of salt. These and other similar events of the Scriptures, he says, are miracles, "powers of God". By means of this power pre-existing elements are changed into new forms from what they were before. The Scripture record of them is an acknowledgment of God's omnipotence, but it does not define them as new creations.

Carrying the analogy of this passage to the Incarnation we would have the following pre-existing elements: God, the Word, the Holy Spirit, Mary. The divine seed united with the human mother resulted in the new being, but not a new creation—it was the changing of the elements into a different form from what they were before. This brings us back to the question discussed earlier, namely, how Christ remained the Son of God if He was changed in form. Menno distinctly teaches that He limited His divine form but not His divine nature.[103] And then to save him-

self, and all others, he says it was the omnipotent power of God working in an incomprehensible manner, but working nevertheless. To admit a creation of Christ's body would have been coming too close in to the old Arian heresy, and Menno would not be found in this because he at one time charged his opponents with that view. So he denies that this may be called a new creation and says those who do so "diametrically oppose the foundation of truth". He would rather, it seems, be understood that it is the power of God working in a new way with old elements. Naturally this would be called miracle because it did not belong to the ordinary course of things. At any rate, it seems clear that he thinks creation is always miracle but miracle is not always creation. In the case of the incarnation it was a miracle but not a creation. From the standpoint of Christ's flesh it was a new synthesis of pre-existing elements.

Earlier in the discussion a reference was made to a contradiction into which Menno is supposed to have fallen. A certain Alenson endeavors to point out that Menno lacked a clear conception of his own teaching. He quotes Menno as saying:

> I do not want to have it said that I explained the incarnation that way, namely, that the Word was changed[104] into human flesh and blood, but that I will leave it to God how much was changed, or what was not changed.

Alenson further says that, at another place, Menno writes thus while discussing the same subject:

> The Scripture says that Lot's wife became [105] a pillar of salt, and the water became wine. Thus says the Scripture and it also became so, but it does not say that the woman took on[106] a pillar of salt, or that the water took on wine. In the same manner the Scripture testifies that the Word became flesh, but it does not say that He took on Himself our flesh.[107]

On the surface it appears that Menno denied to have said that the Word changed and then turned and proved that it did so by the analogy from Lot's wife and the miracle at the Cana marriage feast. Vos also holds this view. He thinks Menno is a poor guide for a rudderless ship on turbulent theological waters. He also calls attention to the fact that Menno himself acknowledged that it is not expedient to preach to the people on such subtle and intricate themes.

Langenwalter takes a kindlier attitude on this point. He also thinks that Menno contradicted himself in regard to his view of the incarnation. That in the heat of discussion he declared

himself as believing that Jesus had merely passed through Mary, but when he wrote his exposition of Psalm 25:19 he says, "In the fulness of time through the power of the Holy Spirit, He became in the womb of the unspotted Virgin, Mary, real flesh and blood, a visible, tangible, and mortal man". Langenwalter then explains that the principle emphasis of Menno and his group was upon Christ's power to produce ethical conduct in the lives of men. Also, when they were compelled to express their beliefs "we do not find that these views were more than an attempt to solve problems in a realm in which they did not feel themselves at home." Nor does he think that one should expect more because of the flux of things and the temper of the times in which they lived and labored.[108]

Needless to say, this is a constructive viewpoina, but does it not grant too much? One cannot but feel that the concession is too great and the explanation too far fetched. True enough, Menno's cardinal virtue was an unflagging devotion to ideals of piety. The times in which he lived were doubtless tempestuous. But the question still remains whether or not he made the bold assertion that the Word did not change and then faced about only to meet himself coming back and saying that it did change. Horsch does not say whether he felt a contradiction or not, but the connection in which he refers to it seems to justify the opinion that he did not.[109]

It now remains to discuss the context of the mooted point to see if one can determine if the charge of inconsistency is correct, partly so, or otherwise. The first quotation occurs in Menno's reply to the charge that he taught that "the Word changed itself into human flesh in the womb of the virgin." As quoted by Alenson, he would not own this statement *in toto,* but says he taught the same as the "high apostle", namely, "the Word became flesh." Then he says, if they can say because I hold that it "became" flesh I must also hold that it was "changed into" flesh, they have not comprehended my thought.[110] He says it is necessary to leave it to God how much was changed and what was not changed. The teaching he has held and expects to hold is that "the Word became flesh."

Recurring to the question of change he says, "change does not always take away the first nature of the substances changed." With Adam for illustration he sets forth his proposition: Man was first earth. He became flesh of the earth in creation. He became earth of flesh in death. He will become flesh again of the

earth in resurrection glory. The point is that "the first substance although changed still remained." And then he says, this parable was not inserted for the purpose of proving that the Word was changed into flesh and blood, in the same manner as the earth was changed into Adam's flesh, but for the purpose of teaching the reader that "if the Word did undergo a change in becoming flesh, it yet remained the Word." Briefly stated, it seems clear that he meant, (positively) "the Word became flesh," and (probably) this may have involved some change, which change, as to kind and degree, we must leave to God, but whatever it was, (if there was any change) the Word itself remained during the process and period of change.

Turning now to the second quotation which is supposed to contradict the first, we find the following elements: (1) An attempt to distinguish between "becoming" and "change"; (2) Lot's wife and the water "became" salt and wine, respectively; (3) The Scripture says so, therefore it is true; (4) They did not "take unto" themselves salt and wine but "became" such; (5) A challenge to the opposition to prove by the Scriptures that "taking unto" means "became". Applied to the incarnation, it seems clear that Menno meant "the Word became flesh," that this becoming process cannot be made to mean "take unto" in the sense in which his opponents claimed, and if he did "take unto" himself Mary's flesh and made it an instrument of suffering as they claimed, then He was not a true Savior. A true Savior can only be God become flesh.

And so the disagreement becomes practically nil. Both passages cling to the old proof text: "the Word became flesh". Both hold that the Word in becoming flesh remained divine. Both strike at the old charge that flesh alone, and not God, suffered. Both maintained a sinlessness of the Word. If there is any disagreement whatsoever, it is the probable and reluctant admission by Menno, in the first passage, that there might have been a change of some kind involved in the process of becoming. But its effect is flattened out by his assertion that such a mystery must be left to God. This is the very focal point of all theories of incarnation. Menno had his problem to explain how true manhood was possible if Mary did not give the actual flesh. Other theories must explain the absence in the Son of her original sin if she did give the actual flesh to the Word. No matter what the approach, the incarnation will remain a problem for the intellect.

It might be asked why Menno did not leave the whole mys-

tery to God, but that would be begging the question. It was a day of fiery trials for teachers. Old views were in flux, and new ones had to blaze their way through whirlwind, dust, and hail. Menno, in this difficult time, explained his view as satisfactorily as any of them and in a finer spirit than many of them.

NOTES

1 *Opera,* 335a; *Works,* II, 119.
2 *Ibid,* 519; *Ibid,* II, 326.
3 *Horsch,* 151, cites Gerretsen's *Micronius,* 1895, p. 44.
4 *Opera,* 324a; *Works,* II, 105.
5 See Horsch's reference (15) to *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* 1912, vol. IV, p. 270.
6 *Opera,* 324; 335a-b; *Works,* II, 105, 119-120. Menno would not have needed to "consign himself to the fire." There were those who would have done it for him.
7 *Opera,* 517-542; *Works,* II, 325-350. See also *Horsch,* 78.
8 *Ibid,* 531b; *Ibid,* II, 337.
9 *Ibid,* 351-382; *Ibid,* II, 139-177.
10 *Horsch,* 78-79. For an attitude less favorable to Menno, Vos, *Menno Simons,* 72f.
11 *Opera,* 552-554; *Works,* II, 355-359.
12 *Horsch,* 89-90; also Vos, *op. cit,* 113; also A. M. Cramer, *Het Leven en de Verrigtingen van Menno Simons,* 107.
13 *Opera,* 79a-b; *Works,* I, 112-113.
14 *Ibid,* 543-618; *Ibid,* II, 351-424.
15 *Op. cit.,* 21; *Vos,* 108f.
16 *Opera,* 314a; *Works,* II, 98.
17 *Ibid,* 314b; *Ibid,* II, 99.
18 *Ibid,* 223-324; *Ibid,* II 1-105.
19 Menno Simons seems to have held that the flesh of man is sinful per se due to the fall. For this reason he maintained that Christ's flesh dare not be of the same substance as that of Mary. A fuller discussion will be found later on.
20 *Opera,* 615b; *Works,* II, 421. It is interesting to notice that all of Menno's controversies over the incarnation were with Zwinglians or those of Zwinglian views. Whether this is due solely to the fact that Menno came in contact only with the Zwinglians or whether it is due to some underlying concept in Zwinglian theology that would lead to disagreement with Menno, would make an interesting topic for research.
21 *Instit. Hist. Eccl.,* Libri IV; Saec. XVI; Sec. III; Pars II; p. 703-4. The Latin follows:
"negavit Menno, Christum Carnem, quam induit, ex sanctissima matre sumsisse: a Spiritu S. e contrario putavit eam in castissimae virginis utero de nihilo productam esse." (Dosker here took over the exact words of Mosheim's translator and quoted them as Mosheim's view. See his *Dutch Anabaptists,* 165).
22 *Plenior deductio Historiae Mennonitarum,* 164, 165. (The reference is taken over from Mosheim, *loc. cit.,* Note 21.
23 "The merciful Lord has by His grace and power, for about twenty years, kept me steady in one sense concerning this foundation of the doctrine." (*Opera,* 562b; *Works,* II, 368.) This was written in 1556, so we may conclude that he became settled in this view about 1536, the same year he left the Roman church.
24 The Mennonites of Holland divided into two groups in 1555. The Flemings were "the conservatives", and the Waterlandians "the liberals." The issue was the application of excommunication.
25 *Tegenwoordige Staet,* 15.
26 See Part II, Section D.

27 *Bib. Ref. Neerl.*, II, 36. (Cited by *Dosker, op. cit.*, 159).
28 *Real-Encyclopaedie,* vol. XII, Article on Menno Simons. (Taken over from *Horsch,* 147, note 3).
29 See Part II, Section D.
30 *The Dutch Anabaptists,* 165-168.
31 *Opera,* 387a; *Works,* II, 184.
32 *Part II,* Section D.
33 *Op. cit.,* 77, 78, 210.
34 *Op. cit.,* 146-152.
35 *Christ's Headship of the Church,* III, 115.
36 Quoted but not cited by Dosker, *Op. cit.,* 160.
37 *A Short History of the Baptists,* 194-5.
38 *Opera,* 313a; *Works,* II, 97.
39 *Ibid,* 321b; *Ibid,* II, 102.
40 *Ibid,* 528b-529; *Ibid,* II, 334-335.
41 These two passages may be considered Menno's favorite proof texts on the incarnation. He sticks close to the idea of becoming as derived from the Greek "ginomai" as used in John 1:14.
42 *Opera,* 530a; *Works,* II, 335-336.
43 "geneert", from "generen", to preserve alive. Not "generated" as the English translators have it; *Works,* II, 330.
44 "gevoedt", from "voeden", to furnish food and sustenance, nourish. (Sometimes also furnish clothing).
45 *Opera,* 525b; *Works,* II, 330.
46 *Ibid,* 531a; *Ibid,* II, 337.
47 *Ibid,* 555b, 564a; *Ibid,* II, 360, 370.
48 "onbevleckte", unspotted, pure, undefiled.
49 *Opera,* 112a; *Works,* I, 154.
50 *Ibid,* 9b; *Ibid,* I, 21.
51 *Ibid,* 174a; *Ibid,* I, 225.
52 "suyvere", also "zuiver", pure, clean, neat.
53 *Opera,* 530; *Works,* II, 336.
54 "sonder sonde", without sin.
55 "reyn", also "rein", pure.
56 *Opera,* 571b; *Works,* II, 379.
57 Menno Simons taught that all descendants "of the impure, sinful flesh of Adam" inherited a depraved and sinful nature which could only be corrected by the sin offering of the human but sinless Christ. For specimen quotations from Menno's teaching on this point see Horsch, *"Life, Labors, and Teachings,"* 236-237.
58 Parentheses are added for explanation, but do not apply to Scripture references.
59 *Opera,* 553; *Works,* II, 358.
60 *Ibid,* 554a; *Ibid,* II, 358.
61 S. Cramer in *R. E.* cited by *Horsch,* 147.
62 *Opera,* 552b-553a; *Works,* II, 357.
63 "gestalte", form, shape, stature.
64 "Om dat hy dienen wilde," in that He wanted (willed) to serve.
65 *Opera,* 554a; *Works,* II, 359.
66 *Ibid,* 552b; *Ibid,* II, 357.
67 Menno frequently disclaimed the validity of philosophic reasoning unless it could be squared by the Scriptures. He also claimed not to use it himself, but to use the Scriptures. He did this fairly consistently except in a very few instances.
68 "eygenschap", also "eigenschap", characteristic, nature, attribute.
69 "wesen", also "wezen", being, existence, essence.
70 "natuere", nature.
71 "substantie", also "substancie", metaphysical essences of being.
72 *Opera,* 589a; *Works,* II, 392.
73 *Ibid,* 589b-590a; *Ibid,* II, 392.
74 "lijdelijck", also "lidelijc", from lijden, to suffer, endure, tolerate, bear, undergo. *Opera,* 525b; *Works,* II, 330.

75 "onlijdelijck", the opposite of note 74.
76 *Opera,* 555a; *Works,* II, 360.
77 *Ibid,* 531b; *Ibid,* II, 337.
78 "in sijn onschuldig vleesch", in his innocent flesh. *Opera* 554a; Works, II, 359.
79 *Opera,* 567b; *Works,* II, 374.
80 *Ibid,* 571b; *Ibid,* II, 379.
81 *Ibid,* 595b; *Ibid,* II, 398.
82 Kühler, W. J., *Het Socinianisme in Nederland,* 42, says, "It is remarkable that while Menno and Dirk Phillips insisted so strongly upon the acceptance of the deity of Christ, both . . . were not clear in their confession of the Trinity. They did not teach that the Holy Spirit had its own individual being separate from that of the Father." Also in the Introduction, vi, "The personality of the Holy Spirit is not taught among them."
83 *Calvin's Tracts,* I, 37.
84 *Creeds of Christendom,* III, 10-11; *Augsburg Confession,* Art. V.
85 "Drie, ware, Godtlijcke wesens," three actual divine beings.
86 *Opera,* 390a; *Works,* II, 187.
87 Garvie, *Handbook of Christian Apologetics,* 155-161.
88 Mullins, *Chr. Rel. in Doctrinal Expression,* 203-210.
89 "gaven", inherited talents or gifts.
90 "wesen", see note 69
91 *Opera,* 390a; *Works,* II, 186.
92 Kühler, *op. cit.,* 42, "den Heyligen Geest te zijn een Krachte Godts, die van den Vader door den Sone uyt-gaet." The Holy Spirit is a power of God which goes out from the Father through the Son. Menno says, *Opera,* 390a, "eenen waren wesentlichen oste persoonlijcken Heyligen Geest . . . voort gaende van den Vader door den Sone." An actually existing or personal Holy Spirit goes out from the Father through the Son.
93 *Opera,* 545; *Works,* II, 352.
94 *Ibid,* 387b, 388a; *Ibid,* II, 184 for both.
95 *Ibid,* 80a; *Ibid,* I, 113. There is some justification to criticize Menno's subjectivity in religion. He does stress exceedingly the idea that an unfriendly God is propitiated and reconciled in Christ, rather than God Himself making the sacrifice in free and illimitable love. Menno called men to God more out of fear of eternal loss and doom than love to God and hope of eternal gain. But this is fairly consistent medieval theology.
96 Horsch, *op. cit.,* 146, note 1.
97 *Opera,* 389b-391a; *Works,* II, 186-188.
98 *Ibid,* 370a; *Ibid,* II, 161.
99 *Of the Imitation of Christ,* Bk. IV, Ch. XVIII, 199. For Menno, *Bib. Ref.* Neerl., VII, 449; *Works,* II, 285.
101 Horsch, *op. cit.,* 147.
102 *Opera,* 570b; *Works,* II, 377.
103 See section on, *"The Natures"*, for full discussion of this point.
104 "verändert", from "veranderen", to change, alter, turn.
105 "worde", became.
106 "aenam", from "aennemen", to take unto.
107 Quoted by Vos, *op. cit.,* 78. They may also be found in their context, the first in *Opera,* 368b; *Works,* II, 159-160; *Werke,* II, 229-230; the second, 370b; II, 162; II, 233.
108 *Christ's Headship of the Church,* 115-117.
109 Horsch says, in his *"Life, Labors, etc."*, 146, note 1, "Vos (p. 78) quotes Alenson who gives two passages from Menno which seem to imply a partly contradiction on a phase of the point in question. In Menno's work the said passages are found in *Opera,* 368b, *Works,* II, 159b; and 370b, II, 162a. Reading them in their connection is required for an intelligent understanding."
110 The same references will suffice as in note 107.

AN AMISH CHURCH DISCIPLINE OF 1781

In 1928 the REVIEW published a series of three articles by Dr. Ernst H. Correll under the title, "The value of family history for Mennonite history: Illustrated from Nafziger family history material of the eighteenth century." The third article of this series included an appendix to a letter written by the Amish bishop, Johannes Nafziger of Essingen in the Palatinate to the Swiss emigrant churches in the Netherlands. This appendix contains some recollections of personal experiences which incidentally furnish valuable information regarding Mennonite life in Europe in the eighteenth century.

It was planned to publish the Nafziger letter itself as a fourth article in the series but this has been unavoidably delayed until now. The letter is here translated and printed for the first time.

It is in fact an Amish church discipline, being a statement of doctrines and practices in Nafziger's church written at the request of the churches in the Netherlands. The introduction, which was written later than the letter itself, suggests that copies of the letter were used as a guide for ministers of the home churches in the Palatinate.

Editor.

BISHOP NAFZIGER'S LETTER TO THE MINISTERS IN THE NETHERLANDS

Introduction

When our co-laborer ministers and elders[1] here in our land learned that we had replied to the request of the ministers and elders in Holland for information regarding our discipline, they also requested that a copy should be prepared for them. This we at first declined to do since it caused us much concern for various reasons, etc. First, would it bring honor and praise to the Lord and contribute to the salvation of men, etc? Second, would it add to the present strife? Third, would it be a hindrance to us or others in the way of arousing pride, etc? Fourth, we hesitated because we ourselves did not have such a written discipline.

But since the brethren and ministers continued to urge us we

[1] It is uncertain whether the original, "Elteste," means bishop or deacon, probably bishop.

finally consented in order to help in the present troubled state of affairs, etc.

A friendly and brotherly greeting to all ministers and elders who have been called with us to labor in the Lord's household, with the request that you remember us in your prayers to the Lord, that he might forgive our much sinning by his grace which we need very much in these dangerous times. It is also our desire to continue steadfast by the grace and help of the Lord in spite of our weakness.

Beloved Friends: From your letter of the 26th of January, 1781, we note among other things that you desire that we write you an account of the discipline and regulations as practiced among the congregations: first, concerning baptism, the required confession of faith and the formula of baptism; second, the manner of performing the marriage ceremony; third, the manner of ordaining ministers and elders; fourth, what further regulations we have in conducting the work of the Lord's household, etc.

Beloved friends and co-laborers, your request is a difficult one since we share with you the weakness of the flesh and come short of the glory of God which we should have....But out of love and a desire to minister to you, we desire nevertheless to accede to your request and in our weakness and limited understanding we shall try to give you a brief account of the discipline as we understand it in the Word of the Lord and as we have received the same from our forefathers and as far as we know in our shortcoming has been practiced down to the present time.

Baptism

When we have applicants who desire to be received into the church of Christ and the congregation of God, whether young men or young women, the same come to us in council before the meeting (services) where they are instructed and are told of the almighty power of God, the creation of heaven and earth and all things visible, which have been created through the Word, the creation of the first man as he was formed by the hand of the Lord, etc., how the breath of life was breathed into him and he became a living soul created for eternal life, was placed in the Paradise, where they were given commandments and prohibitions, etc., how they however were deceived by the serpent, became disobedient to their creator and consequently subject to death, after which they were expelled from the paradise and placed upon the earth so that the way to life was closed and guarded by the angel, cherubim, etc., also how eternal death was promised to them, etc.

Further how the promise was given to them again, etc., and a Savior promised, an offering for the sin of Adam and Eve and all those who from the heart believe on him and repent from the heart, confess the Almighty One in the triune name, the almighty Father who has created all things, the Son of the almighty God, through whom all that is was created, the Holy Ghost, who proceeds from

the Father and Son and is poured out in the hearts of all believers, etc. Thus, the triune name of God is pronounced, but as one divine being, etc. This true Son of God hath God raised up as our comfort and salvation, etc. Then the gospel of grace is preached, with repentance and improvement of life, unto faith in the Holy Gospel. How the Son witnessed to his power and the Gospel, also to the glory of his heavenly Father, with many signs and wonders, etc., until his death, which he suffered for us. Then it is explained to them how he came to John and himself desired to be baptized, and also received the same, etc., and how after his resurrection he conversed for forty days with his disciples and revealed to them the full will and counsel of his heavenly Father, saying to them: To me is given all power in heaven and on earth, therefore go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded to you, and I shall be with you always until the end of the world, etc. Further, how he was taken up before their eyes into heaven and is seated at the right hand of his heavenly father, from whence he shall come to judge the living and the dead and to give to each one his reward according to his works, etc.

Further they are told about the new birth and the improvement of life, etc. The 18 articles in the book of the Confession of Faith are taught to them, etc. Then the congregation is also admonished to diligently watch over the new applicants to instruct them and support them by their good example.

When they have been on probation for a time and have remained faithful, the congregation is asked whether they have been diligent in reading and prayer, and have given a good and peaceful account of themselves, and whether anyone is a hindrance, but whether all are in good hope to have built on the rock, etc.

Then our confession of faith and discipline is once more made known to them, they are asked whether they believe from the heart that this is the Word of the Lord and the way to eternal life, etc. They are given the liberty to take a longer time if they desire to build better or desire better instruction, etc. But if they desire from the heart to continue and not turn back, in the same meeting, after the first prayer, John III and Romans VI are read and explained to them, etc. They are then urged to have faith and true repentance for baptism, to die to sin, and rise with Christ in newness of life, etc. Then, a passage is read from the Acts of the Apostles, where Peter says: Ye men of Israel, hearken unto my words. Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved by God with signs and wonders and mighty works, whom God placed in your midst, as ye yourselves know, the same, according to the foredetermined will and counsel of God, ye took and with wicked hands nailed to the cross and slew, etc. So let the whole house of Israel know that this Jesus whom ye crucified God hath made both Lord and Christ, etc. Flee from this perverse generation. Those who gladly heard his word were baptized, etc.

With these words the applicants are requested to come before the ministers and when they have fallen on their knees the story of Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch is told them, how he was reading the prophet Isaiah but did not understand it and how then Philip preached the Gospel to him, so that he desired to be baptized, and Philip baptized him. Then the applicant for baptism is asked: Do you believe from your whole heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God? Answer, yes. Do you also believe that God has raised him from the dead, and are you willing to be obedient to God and the Church, whether to live or to die? Answer, Yes.

When then the head has been uncovered, whether young man or young woman, the bishop places his hands on the head and a fully ordained deacon pours water on his hands, whereupon the bishop calls him by name and says: On this confession of faith which thou hast confessed, thou art baptized in the name of God the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. Then the bishop gives him his hand and raises him up, pronounces peace and says: The Lord continue the good work which he hath begun in you and complete it unto a blessed end through Jesus Christ. He then dismisses him in the name of God.

If no fully ordained deacon is present, another minister is permitted to pour the water into the hands of the bishop.

Marriage

As to the procedure of marriage, first, no one is permitted to marry an unbeliever, but is required to marry a member of the church, who has accepted the Christian faith and been baptized. Nor may it be one who is guilty of sin or has been set back or expelled from the church.

A person who desires to marry is first to call on the Lord for wisdom, then to take counsel with his parents, and when possible also with the ministers or elders. Then a deacon is to conduct his suit for him. If however no deacon is to be had, another minister may act in this capacity and bring the reply according to the example of Eliezer, the servant of Abraham. If a ceremony is finally to be performed, a bishop inquires of the deacon whether the matter has been conducted in proper order and whether anything stands in the way.

Then both persons are asked by the bishop in council whether it is their desire with the help of the Lord to enter into the state of matrimony, whether there is any hindrance of any sort in the way, or whether they have fallen into sin, and whether they have diligently sought the will of the Lord in their purpose, etc. If then nothing is found to stand in the way, and they continue to desire marriage and prayer to the Lord, then our articles of faith are read to them briefly. If they confess the same and continue in their intention, they are told that we allow no divorce except for adultery, and that they should well consider while they still have the freedom of choice, etc.

When they appear in the meeting for the ceremony, after the first prayer, Matthew 19 is read as far as it deals with marriage. Then I Corinthians 7 and Ephesians 5 from the 9th verse to the end are read and expounded and the contents repeated. Then the minister says: Since as concerns the matter of marriage we find little more in the New Testament, we shall turn to the Old Testament, where Christ the Lord teaches us as has just been read to us in Matthew 19, where he says: Have you not read that in the beginning when he made man he made him male and female, etc. (In the counsel they are told that the man should not go to his wife in the time of her menstruation, but should withhold himself according to Leviticus 15. A wise man hearkens unto God in all things, etc.)

So we read of Abraham, the father of all the faithful, how he said to the oldest servant in his household: Thou shalt not take for my son a wife from among the daughters of the Canaanites, in whose land ye live, but shaltst go to my native land to my relatives and take a wife for him there, etc. How his master took his oath, and how he prayed, and how the Lord brought it to pass that Rebecca became the wife of his son, etc.

Then we find how the old and pious Tobias of the tribe and city of Naphtali taught his son from youth up to fear God and give alms. He did not go to the golden calves but to the temple of the Lord in Jerusalem, and prayed there to the God of Israel, etc. He also did not defile himself with the meat of the heathen. And how his father sent him to seek a faithful man to [text here corrupt], and how he found a good young man and brought him to his father, who greeted him and comforted him in his blindness. How Raphael the angel accompanied the young man and told him to clean the fish but retain the heart, the gall and the liver, etc. How Tobias asked his companion the value of these things, and also asked him where they should stay, and he answered: There is a man here by the name of Raguel, dear friend, who has a daughter Sara and no other child, to whom all his property belongs, and his daughter is to be your wife, so court her.

How Tobias was fearful because the seven husbands whom she had had all died and been strangled by the devil Asmodi, etc. Whereupon the angel said: Listen to what I tell you and I will show you over whom the devil has power, namely over those who enter upon marriage without respecting God in their hearts, but rather follow the desire of the body like the mule and the horse who know nothing else—over such the devil has power. When you take her to wife, withhold yourself for three days. But on the first night broil the fish over a fire, and you will drive the devil away. On the second night you will be admitted into the company of the patriarchs. On the third night you will receive the blessing of God to be enabled to have healthy children, etc. And so they stopped with Raguel and he received them with great joy.

After these words the two applicants for marriage are asked: If you still desire to marry as you have confessed before us, come forward. Then the minister says: Here are two persons who desire

with the help of the Lord to enter upon the state of Matrimony. According to the world it is customary that the banns are called three times, but with us it is not customary. But if anyone is present who has anything against the marriage he is to speak. Then the minister remains quiet a time. If no one speaks he says: We trust there is no one. Then he says to the man: Can you confess that through prayer it has been brought about that this sister is to be given to you in marriage? Answer, yes. And is it your intention to be true to her and not forsake her, and not to separate from her until death separate you? Answer, yes. Then to the woman: Can you confess that through prayer it has been brought about that this brother is to be given to you in marriage? Answer, yes. And is it your intention to remain true to him and not forsake him, and not to separate from him until death separate you? Answer, yes. Then the minister says: We have heard what the angel commanded to Tobias, etc., and how he stopped at the house of Raguel and he said: Whence comest thou, dear brother? Tobias answered: Of the tribe of Naphtali, out of the captivity of Nineveh. Raguel said: Do you know my brother Tobias? Tobias said: We know him well. And when they had prepared a meal and requested them to sit down at the table, Tobias said: I will not eat or drink here until you grant me my request and promise to give me your daughter. Raguel was frightened, for he knew well how it had gone with the other seven, and stood hesitating and gave the young man no answer. Then the angel said: Thou shalt not refrain from giving him thy daughter, for thy daughter belongs to this God-fearing man, wherefore she may not have another. Raguel said: I doubt not that God has heard my prayer and tears and believe also that God has for this reason sent you to me that my daughter might be married to one of her nation according to the law of Moses. Now, doubt not, I will give her to you. And he took the right hand of his daughter and gave her to the righteous Tobias and said: The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob unite you and fill you with his blessing, and so he promised them in marriage.

Then further the story is told of how Sara prepares another room where she goes and weeps, and is comforted by her father, etc. The young man is taken to her, and according to the counsel of the angel a piece of the liver is broiled on the fire and the angel takes the devil captive and takes him away bound into the wilderness of upper Egypt. Tobias said: Arise, Sara, let us call upon God tomorrow and the next day, for in these three nights we desire to be reconciled with God, for we are children of the Holy One and it is not fitting that we conduct ourselves as do the heathen. Tobias then prays with Sara, that the Lord may protect her, etc. Tobias said: Lord God, our Father, heaven and earth shall praise thee. Thou didst make Adam out of the dust of the earth, and didst give Eve to him as a companion, etc. And Sara said: Have mercy on us, O Lord, have mercy, that we may both attain a good old age in peace and good health, etc.

Then they are permitted to depart in the name of God as man

and wife. Then the story is told of how Raguel prepared a grave, etc. But both newly married persons were found safe and sound and praised the Lord, etc. Raguel prepared a feast for all his friends and neighbors, promised Tobias the half of his possessions, etc. The Angel received the money and brought it to the marriage feast, etc., and wished them fortune and happiness. The mother of Tobias was anxious concerning her son, etc. On the eleventh day they approached Haran, etc. Tobias and his companion draw near, take of the gall of the fish, etc. The Angel tells him to praise God as soon as he enters the house, etc. Tells him to stroke the eyes of his father, and he will see again and will rejoice at his appearing, etc. They counseled concerning what they should give the faithful companion, who had protected them from the fish, etc., had driven the spirits from them, had brought joy to their parents, brought him safe home, and made his father to see again, and from whom all had received so much good. So they gave him the half, etc. The angel said: Praise the Lord of heaven, etc.

Prayer and fasting is a good thing. To give alms is better than to gather wealth, etc. For this reason I speak the truth to you and withhold nothing, etc. Since you were pleasing to God he has given you health. For I am Raphael, one of the seven angels who stand before God. That I came to you is the will of God, etc. You thought I ate and drank with you, but not so, etc. Now the time is at hand for me to return to the one who sent me, etc. Praise God and proclaim his wonderful works. Whereupon he disappeared from their sight, etc.

Further, the duties of marriage are expounded to them, etc.

(It happened on one occasion, that as the bridegroom was standing waiting before the minister, the bride failed to appear, but instead went out. The bridegroom however remained standing before the minister, and spoke out boldly, that whoever had the desire should come and stand by his side. So a young woman arose and came to his side, and when the minister asked the usual questions they both answered, yes. And so the two were united in marriage and lived peaceably and happily. But the one who failed to appear was disciplined.)

Choice and Ordination of Ministers and Deacons

After the brotherhood has been repeatedly admonished to pray the Lord of the harvest with fasting and pleading to send laborers into his harvest, and the ministers together with the congregation have taken the voice of the brethren and sisters, and when in every congregation where it is necessary the voice has been taken, as soon as the services are dismissed, before the congregation has departed, those who have been voted for are called before the ministers and are instructed in the articles of faith and the discipline of the church and asked whether they do confess the same. Answer, yes. Then they are reminded how they have promised in baptism to be obedient to God and the church, etc.

The one who has received the most votes is then named by the minister who says: Since the most votes have fallen upon you, you are appointed to the office of preacher in the name of the church and in the name of the Lord, so that you are to admonish the people with the word of the Lord, conduct prayers, visit the widows and orphans, care for and comfort, watch over the congregation according to the discipline, assist the elders in the work of the Lord, etc. (To the others who had been voted for he says: Although you did not receive the office this time, you do not know how soon you may be called. So continue diligent in prayer and good works.)

Thereupon he gives him his hand and says: The Lord help you and be with you. After he has been on probation a time and it is considered advisable to confirm him in his office and the majority of votes have again fallen upon him, after the services he is called before the bishops in the presence of the congregation, he is reminded of the articles of faith and the order of the church and asked whether he still confesses the same. And the answer is "Yes". Thereupon he falls on his knees before the bishop, and two bishops and a deacon [ein Bestaetigter] at his sides place their hands upon his head....Then the bishop says: In the name of the Lord and in the name of the church, the full office of minister of the word is conferred upon you to serve the church with teaching, admonition, baptism, communion, marriage, bann and excommunication, to accept and reject repentant sinners, to exclude sinful and disobedient members from the church, also to ordain others in the service according to the regulation, as a true and faithful father in the house of God, according to the Gospel and your calling, etc.

But if a deacon is to be chosen for the care of the poor, votes are taken, and the one chosen is dealt with according to the previously described order up to the following words: In the name of the Lord and the name of the church, the ministry to the poor is conferred upon you, and you are to receive the alms, and administer the same in behalf of the poor and needy saints in counsel with the ministers and elders, to visit and care for the sick, the poor, the suffering, the widows and the orphans, to minister to those who request aid, and in matters of the government and discipline of the church or in dealings with the government to aid the elders and not leave the burden on them alone, but to serve the church according to your calling. . . .

If a deacon has been chosen in the congregation the alms are to be given to him and he is to render an account of the same. But if he is to be confirmed[1] in his ministry as deacon, it is to be done with the counsel of the church and the ministers, and the articles of faith and the order of the church is read to him and he is asked whether he still confesses the same. The answer is, "Yes". Then he is asked whether he wishes to remain true to these articles and the discipline. Answer, yes. Thereupon he kneels before the elders,

[1] There were two degrees in the office of the deacon, namely, ordinary deacon and confirmed or fully ordained deacon.

and two elders and a confirmed deacon place their hands upon his head, and an elder says: In the name of the Lord and in the name of the church you are confirmed in your office. And the above points are again read to him. And further, he is instructed that it is his calling to pay attention to the teaching and preaching that it may be done in the right way according to the Word of God, and is to testify to the same. If the minister has made a mistake, he is to correct him in love and bring him to the right, but it is to be done in private so that the minister is not put to shame before the congregation. And if no fully confirmed deacon is present, an ordinary deacon who has observed a mistake or error is permitted to call attention to the mistake in meekness and love and set him right, etc.

Conclusion

Beloved friends and co-laborers. Herewith we have tried in great weakness and simplicity to explain to you briefly the various points in our church discipline. And since in several points we have written but a few words, we request that you improve and complete the same in love and receive this our request as out of love and good will, since you also have the Old and New Testament as well as we. We should be very glad to learn that you have been able to improve this writing to the glory of God and the salvation of men through the Word of the Lord and his blessed will.

It is quite possible that some things be practiced in one congregation which are not so practiced in other congregations, although this should only be in minor points, and nothing contrary to the Word of the Lord. Concerning such matters there should be no complaining, and peace and love should not be allowed to suffer thereby, etc.

If you consider it useful, a copy of this writing could be sent to each congregation.

Herewith we greet you once more and commend you to God who is able to build you up and to give you the inheritance among the saints, etc.

Essingen, March 26, 1781.
Hanss Nafziger.

Bear with us and write us in love again.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der oberdeutschen Taufgesinnten im 16. Jahrhundert: Pilgram Marbecks Antwort auf Kaspar Schwenckfelds Beurteilung des Buches der Bundes-bezeugung von 1542. Herausgegeben von J. LOSERTH. Wien und Leipzig: Kommissionsverlag der Verlagsbuchhandlung Carl Fromme Gesellschaft m. b. H. 1929. pp. xxii, 592.

For more than forty years Hofrath Professor Dr. Johann Loserth has devoted a large share of his time to the most painstaking research into the early history of the great antipedobaptist movement in Austria and its dependencies during the first half of the sixteenth century. This fruitful investigation, together with similar devotion to the documentary history of the Wiclifite movement in England and the Hussite movement in Bohemia, and to the Counter Reformation in Austria, along with almost continuous university teaching since 1871 at Czernowitz and Graz, has filled an unusually long and active life. Now in his eighty-fourth year he seems to be in full possession of his powers, still keenly interested in such work. A few years ago it was the good fortune of Dr. Christian Hege and Dr. Christian Neff, editors of the *Mennonitisches Lexikon,* now in course of publication, to enlist his services in the preparation of many biographical and topical articles along the lines of his researches.

Readers of this journal will remember Dr. Loserth's contribution to the *Gedenkschrift zum* 400 *Jachrigen Jubilaeum der Mennoniten oder Taufgesinnten* of an elaborate article on the controversy between Schwenckfeld and Marbeck, as an appendix to which he published for the first time Marbeck's long letter to Schwenckfeld in which he remonstrates with him for his uncharitable and unjust criticism of his (Marbeck's) exposition of his views and those of his brethren on doctrine and practice, published in 1642, in Schwenckfeld's *Judicium* (judgment on the baptism booklet of the Baptists) published at the end of 1644. In the *Gedenkschrift* Christian Hege published an exact reprint (with introduction) of Marbeck's *Vermahnung* which called forth Schwenckfeld's *Judicium.* The main facts about this controversy and the earlier amicable relations at Strassburg between the two disputants are well known and are set forth in my *History of Anti-Pedobaptism* (pp. 251-2) on the basis of an earlier article by Loserth.

The most diligent research has failed to bring to light much additional information regarding the early life and education of Pilgram Marbeck. That he was a native Tyrolese, (born at or near Rattenberg) seems certain. That he received a classical education his familiarity with Latin and his Latin style abundantly prove. Further evidence of his accomplishments are his eminence as an engineer and the high social recognition that he enjoyed, despite his unpopular religious views, his mastery of

Scripture, his theological acumen, and his facility in argumentation. There is no evidence whatever that he was trained in a monastery and it is not likely that a renegade monk would have found honorable employment in the mines. Loserth reaches the conclusion that he received his education in the Rattenberg Latin school, which at the time maintained, in connection with the mining industries, courses of instruction in mining engineering. At any rate we find him in 1520 with the status of a skilled mechanician or engineer in the lower Inn valley. Before 1525 we find him occupying the position of mining superintendent, with a salary of 1000 gulden.

Precisely when and under whose influence he became an antipedobaptist cannot be ascertained. He himself tells us that having been brought up by pious parents as a papist he came under the influence of Lutheran preaching; but observing that in communities where Lutheranism was triumphant a fleshly license prevailed he accepted baptism as a witness of obedience and faith. The great antipedobaptist movement in the Tyrol led by Blaurock, Hutter and others, in which thousands had been converted, had reached Rattenberg, and exterminating measures that were to result in the martyrdom of hundreds and the banishment of thousands had been inaugurated. About January, 1528, Marbeck was compelled to take refuge in Germany. We find him first in Augsburg and in neighboring communities where he gained a livelihood by practicing his engineering art. In October he settled in or near Strassburg, where a larger measure of toleration than elsewhere prevailed and where, besides the recognized ministers of the Zwinglian type, a number of antipedobaptists were hospitably entertained. Here he soon found recognition among the official and business leaders, as well as among the ministers, because of his fine personality, his intelligence and his engineering skill, and came to be recognized among the hundreds of antipedobaptists as a trusted leader.

Among the refugees at Strassburg with whom Marbeck maintained cordial relations was Kaspar Schwenckfeld, a Silesian noble, who agreed with Marbeck in rejecting infant baptism, but as a mystic could see no need for water baptism, regarding baptism of the spirit as sufficient. While persistently refusing to ally himself with the antipedobaptists he frequently expressed high admiration for their sacrificial spirit and their devotion to what they believed to be the requirements of the Gospel (See my *Antipedobaptism,* p. 155ff).

From October, 1528, to some time in 1530 Marbeck resided in the Stein valley and was engaged in the construction of waterways for bringing timber and fuel to Strassburg. When he took up his residence in the city he was received with open arms by the ministers and gentry, who "gloried in his intellectual gifts and his confident, courageous and good zeal for the Gospel." In the meantime the antipedobaptists, many of whose leaders took refuge in the city from time to time, had become numerous and aggressive, and Marbeck was drawn into controversy as their leader and defender. His masterly defense of the antipedobaptist position in public debate and in printed tracts, along with powerful pressure from without for the extirpation of heresy, rendered his position in Strassburg untenable. Bucer now declared him an obstinate heretic, but felt obliged to acknowledge that both he and

his wife were unblamable in their lives. The imprisonment of Marbeck, their efforts to convert him to their views, and their cooperation in his banishment, constitute a blot on the characters of Bucer and Capito who had earlier shown themselves more tolerant than most of the reformers.

Marbeck returned to Augsburg or its vicinity and, while practicing his profession for a living, devoted himself with remarkable zeal to the propagation of his antipedobaptist principles. In the region between Augsburg and Ulm he seems to have been instrumental in founding or fostering a number of vigorous antipedobaptist churches. Far more than any other educated antipedobaptist leader, he enjoyed, because of his engineering skill, the toleration, the financial independence and the leisure that enabled him to engage in continuous, concentrated literary work for the defense of his principles and the edification of his brethren.

While Schwenckfeld had frequently expressed his opposition to infant baptism as one of the most corrupting practices that had invaded Christendom, and while he had often commended in a qualified way the antipedobaptists of his acquaintance, he had never expressed approval of the stress they laid on believers' baptism and on the celebration of the Lord's Supper and its restriction to baptized believers in good fellowship. When the Strassburg authorities began persecuting the antipedobaptists he was accused of being himself an Anabaptist and out of sympathy with the order, and was in danger of losing his welcome. Without withdrawing his opposition to infant baptism he now began to reproach the Anabaptists with slavery to the letter and lack of spirituality in laying stress on the ordinances and in disfellowshipping all who did not conform to their views of baptism, the Lord's Supper, and rigorous church discipline. He felt concerned to make it clear to the public that he was not only not himself an Anabaptist but that he thoroughly disapproved of their principles. He now began to assert more emphatically than ever that "God's word is not letter, but spirit, power and life." Helene Streicher, an educated gentlewoman, who had embraced Schwenckfeld's views and was personally devoted to him, undertook (doubtless at his behest) to convert Marbeck to Schwenckfeld's views. Many letters were exchanged between them. Each correspondent naturally grew more and more polemical, Schwenckfeld, no doubt, furnishing Helene with her ammunition.

The correspondence closed with a long letter by Marbeck, in which he vindicated his truly Scriptural position over against the professedly "spiritual" position of Schwenckfeld. This polemic, which was perhaps unnecessarily caustic and censorious, was soon afterward elaborated and enlarged and published under a long title beginning *Vermahnung* in 1542. This spirited defense of his principles against Schwenckfeld's unfair criticisms, of which several copies are extant, covered 200 printed pages. It was reprinted with an introduction by Dr. Christian Hege in the *Gedenkschrift,* where it fills about 100 closely printed pages. It would appear that Marbeck and Schwenckfeld were both deeply interested in the Streicher family and

their connections. Schwenckfeld seems to have anticipated Marbeck in gaining an influence over them and was deeply concerned to retain their allegiance. Marbeck too was anxious to win them to his views and to prevent the spread among his own adherents of what he regarded as the unchristian views of Schwenckfeld. The Streicher family remained true to Schwenckfeld. Irritated beyond measure by Marbeck's polemic, Schwenckfeld put into the hands of the Streichers and their friends his *Judicium,* a rejoinder to Marbeck's *Vermahnung* in a hundred sections, with the strict injunction that it should not be shown to any one except to the Anabaptists and his own adherents. He was evidently deeply concerned to win to his views Marbeck's followers and to protect his own followers from Marbeck's influence, but claimed (hypocritically as Marbeck thought) not to wish to seem to justify the state church persecutors of the Anabaptists.

When a copy of the *Judicium* came into Marbeck's hands he seems to have determined, probably in consultation with his leading brethren (Leopold Scharnschlager also a Tyrolese seems to have collaborated with Marbeck in the *Vermahnung* and the *Verantwortung*), to prepare an exhaustive refutation of the hundred articles of Schwenckfeld one by one. In the *Verantwortung* Marbeck copies each of Schwenckfeld's hundred criticisms (usually only a paragraph) and devoted many pages to proving that Schwenckfeld has misrepresented the teachings of the Anabaptists, has ignored or misrepresented the teachings of Scripture, has contradicted his own teachings in his printed works, and has shown a thoroughly unchristian spirit in his polemics. Each point is elaborated in the most thorough way, the pertinent Scriptures being exhaustively quoted and interpreted. Much repetition in Schwenckfeld's *Judicium* and Marbeck's answers renders the work rather tedious reading; but it is doubtful whether the points of doctrine and practice in which Mennonites and Baptists agree have ever been treated more sanely or exhaustively.

The *Verantwortung* was doubtless two years in preparation (1544-1546) and if intended for the press its voluminousness and the severe governmental restrictions on the freedom of the press, apart from the expense involved and the danger to his people of too much publicity were sufficient to prevent publication. Besides these considerations, the author must have been in failing health when his great literary task was completed. The Schmalkald War (1546 onward) in which evangelical religion of every type was imperilled and general distress prevailed must also have made publication difficult. But fortunately the work has been preserved in three manuscripts, one in Zürich, one in Munich, and one in Olmütz. The two latter are in the same handwriting, that of Walpurga Marschalk, an educated gentlewoman who was devoted to the author and in full sympathy with his views, and a number of whose relatives are known to have been Anabaptists.

Loserth considers the Zürich manuscript the most important as having been corrected by Marbeck himself. On the front cover is written the name Walpurga Marschälkin, 1571. At the end of the first part the owner states that this manuscript was corrected in 1571

by a copy presented to Magdalena by Marbeck himself. Another note by Walpurga states that the first part of the *Verantwortung* was sent by the author to Schwenckfeld, who made no reply. This manuscript contains also a number of other important Anabaptist documents. There is also in this manuscript an intimation that several brethren were concerned in the production of the *Verantwortung* and that its composition required many years and days. The Munich and Olmütz manuscripts are in the same handwriting. Both were evidently official copies. These also contain a number of important documents besides Marbeck's magnum opus.

Loserth carefully copied the Zürich manuscript and edited it for Dr. Hege and his Mennonite brethren in Europe and America, carefully comparing it with the other manuscripts, providing it with all necessary introductory matter out of the fulness of source materials gathered during his long and industrious life, and (with Dr. Hege) arranging for its printing in the most permanent and elegant form and with remarkable perfection of proofreading. It is indeed a monumental work. Dr. Hege's "Geleitwort" precedes Dr. Loserth's "Einleitung" of 53 pages in which he tells us all we need to know about the controversy and the documents and summarizes the contents of the different sections of the *Verantwortung*. Then follows Pilgram Marbeck's letter to Kaspar Schwenckfeld dated December 31, 1544. Next we have a facsimile page from the Munich manuscript. The *Verantwortung über Casparn Schwenckfelds Judicium,* covers 524 closely printed octavo pages, including in smaller type as the text of each of the hundred divisions one of Schwenckfeld's *Judicium* articles. Between part one and part two are two "Nachträge," one on the biography of Pilgram Marbeck confirming the view that he was educated in the Latin school of Rattenberg with courses in mining engineering and that he incurred censure, probably for Anabaptist heresy as early as April, 1525, another on *The Interpretation of the Testament,* which Marbeck frequently refers to in his great work. This was probably a composite work in which Marbeck himself must have had a large share. No copy of this work has yet come to light. Reference is also made to an Anabaptist work entitled *To-day and Yesterday* in which Old Testament teachings and practices superseded by the Christianity of the New Testament are enumerated and discussed. There follows as "Beilage," Marbeck's letter to Helene Streicher which precipitated the controversy with Schwenckfeld.

Loserth is fully justified in pronouncing Schwenckfeld's one hundred criticisms of Marbeck and the Anabaptists and Marbeck's one hundred exhaustive rejoinders covering the entire province of Anabaptist doctrine, reproduced in this volume, one of the most distinctive works in the realm of the polemical literature of the Reformation time. The composition of Marbeck's *Verantwortung* was apparently completed in 1546, when Germany was in the throes of the Schmalkald war. If the author intended it for publication the unsettled conditions until the Peace of Augsburg (1555) would have presented prohibitive obstacles. If Marbeck could have foreseen that in 1929 his great work edited in the most scientific way by one of the most accomplished and

experienced Protestant research workers in the world, in the elegant form in which it lies before us, he would doubtless have rejoiced with joy unspeakable, however much he might have regretted the long delay. If he could have foreseen that in 1930 there would be, scattered over three continents, more than half a million Mennonites, his more direct successors, besides twelve million antipedobaptists (Baptists, Christians, etc.) who are in substantial agreement with him in their interpretation of primitive Christianity and their contention that New Testament doctrine and practice should be normative for all time, he would have had still more abundant cause for rejoicing.

It is worthy of remark that, so far as the writer remembers, Loserth has never in any of his numerous works on the Anabaptists used an unkind or unsympathetic word regarding their doctrines or practice. He has no doubt aimed at complete objectivity, but one can hardly escape the conviction that he profoundly sympathizes with the antipedobaptists in their contentions and sufferings for the restoration of the Christianity of the New Testament type, for religious liberty, and for the complete separation of church and state. In carrying out this great enterprise, in his cooperation with the Mennonites in the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the introduction of believer's baptism in Switzerland, in 1925, and in his numerous contributions to the *Mennonitisches Lexikon* he has shown himself highly sympathetic with Mennonite and Baptist people and principles.

It is manifestly impracticable in an article like this even to summarize each of Schwenckfeld's hundred specific criticisms of Marbeck's earlier work and each of Marbeck's exhaustive rejoinders. Loserth has given us a succinct statement of their chief differences in his fine introduction.

Marbeck, who had wholly lost confidence in Schwenckfeld's moral integrity, pronounces the *Judicium* not true and ingenuous, nor free from unworthy accusations and revilings. It does not advance its cause with Christian moderation, modesty and patience. He calls into question the sincerity of his opponent in his expressed desire that the *Judicium* should not come into the hands of the persecutors of the Anabaptists, which is just as lacking in truth as the whole *Judicium*. He is not ashamed to defend the truth against all untruth. He accuses Schwenckfeld of attempting to proselytize by lying accusations. Without accusing Marbeck of failure in charity and forbearance, we cannot but hope that the aged mystic was less malicious and untruthful than Marbeck conceived him to be.

Albert Henry Newman.

Building on the Rock: An Account of the First Quarter of a Century of Mission Work done by the American Mennonite Mission, Dhamtari, C. P., India, 1899-1924. Written by the Missionaries. Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Mennonite Publishing House. 1926. pp. 198. $2.50.

Twenty-five Years With God in India. Written by the India Missionaries as a memorial of their Semi-Jubilee Anniversary of the Founding of the Mission. Berne, Indiana: Mennonite Book Concern. 1929. pp. 250. $2.00

Two anniversary volumes have been published as parts of the commemorative activities that marked the close of twenty-five years of established and continuous work in India by two Mennonite missions. The missionaries of the American Mennonite Mission published their volume, *Building on the Rock,* in 1926. More recently the General Conference Mennonite Mission has put out as a memorial of the semi-jubilee of its founding the book *Twenty Five Years With God in India.* Both of these missions are located in the Central Provinces of India where the American Mennonite Mission was founded in 1899 with headquarters at Dhamtari, about 450 miles west and south of Calcutta. The General Conference Mennonite Mission was founded in 1901 at Champa, which is located less than one hundred and fifty miles north and east from Dhamtari.

The history of these two missions has been closely parallel both in their origin and their growth and in size at the end of twenty-five years of work. It may seem singular that God should have moved upon the two largest groups of Mennonites in North America to launch their first foreign missionary efforts at nearly the same moment. This coincidence is explained in part by the fact that severe famine conditions prevailed in parts of India during the years from 1897 to 1899. Each group had sent relief from America for the famine sufferers in the form of grain and provisions, so that all eyes became directed toward the needs of India, the spiritual needs of her population as well as the physical needs. The establishment of the American Mennonite Mission was in part also a result of the spiritual awakening that swept over the main body of American Mennonites in the eighteen nineties, although most of this group had been settled in America for a century and more. On the other hand the General Conference mission was founded directly by the German Mennonites who had migrated from Russia during the seventies and eighties. Six of its early missionaries were natives of Russia and a majority of the workers sent out to this mission since have been from the same group of recent immigrants.

Each of these books presents to the reader a fairly good picture of the work that is being done by the respective missions, as complete a picture, perhaps, as can be given in brief compass by writing. There is first, after a statement of the steps that led to the decision to send out missionaries, a description of the early beginnings, then of the slow but steady growth, the patient sowing of the Gospel seed and the faithful witnessing to the saving power of Jesus Christ, and finally the establishment of various institutions, benevolent, educational, medical, etc. As the means available and the number of helpers increased, new stations were opened. The results accomplished and the prospects for the future are also described.

The emphasis placed upon direct and indirect evangelism is strong in both of these missions. All benevolent and educational activities are made to serve the one end of winning individual souls to Jesus Christ. Each book describes the peculiar difficulties that hinder spiritual growth among the Indian converts and the heroic efforts put forth to develop an indigenous Indian church. Each mission sees in the children of the first generation of converts, who are now in the mission schools, the greatest

hope for the future of the native church. The prospects for the next quarter century are regarded as very bright.

Each of the missions conducts a leper home and these are said to be among the largest and best in India to-day. Funds for buildings and for the support of these homes are provided by government and by the mission to lepers of England, the missions doing all the administrative work. Medical work is carried on extensively by the missions; each having three medical doctors and a number of trained nurses on the field.

The American Mennonite Mission is conducting more institutiona work than does the General Conference mission. Especially is this true in the case of institutions for higher education. The two missions cooperate in part in this work. During the year 1927-28 for example the General Conference mission provided forty-four scholarships for worthy boys and girls from their stations for studying in advanced schools outside of the district, due to the lack of schools at home. Of this number thirty-one were attending schools of the American Mennonite Mission as high school, vocational schools, English school, Bible school. The General Conference mission appears to question the wisdom of much advanced education for the Indian Christians of the present generation as it tends to educate them away from their own people and in some cases makes them reluctant to engage in direct evangelism. The American Mennonite Mission however, has far more nearly all the children of its communicant members in primary schools than has the General Conference mission. The latter has not been able to do as much teaching as is desirable, because there has been something of a mass movement into the church on one part of its territory, an experience that the other mission has not had as yet. The communicant membership at each mission was well over a thousand and the number active missionaries in each was about thirty at the end of twenty-five years.

It may be pertinent to ask the question whether the Mennonite church has a unique program for missionary activity or a distinctive message for heathen peoples to-day. So far as concerns these two missions in India, the anniversary volumes reflect a zeal and an earnestness that is reminiscent of the early Anabaptist and Mennonite leaders and of the aggressive leaders since their time. There is the characteristic evangelical tone with strong emphasis upon individual conversion, upon personal faith in Jesus Christ and loyalty to Him, upon holy living and spiritual growth. The Bible as God's Word is handed forth as a vital seed that produces Christian character and saintly lives in every land. As for the details of church organization, government and discipline and of sundry social customs, there is expressed the opinion by both missions that as the indigenous Church becomes more independent and self-supporting and grows in spirituality it will be able successfully to work out these matters in accordance with the principles of the Word of God which they have been carefully taught. The American Mennonite Mission, at least, states its program as being that of teaching the full Gospel, of teaching the "all things" as Christ commanded in His last commission. It expresses strong confidence that the India Mennonite church will, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, meet and solve its future problems to the glory of God and the advancement of His kingdom.

The books under discussion are well illustrated throughout, the one of the American Mennonite Mission giving by photographs more of the life and resources of India, while the illustrations of the other book are centered somewhat more around the personalities of the missionaries. Both books are composite in authorship with only small portions assigned to the writers. It would not seldom add interest to chapter or section if the writer's name were duly given. *Building on the Rock* is especially rich in illustrative anecdotes, stories and reminiscences which add to the interest. Its style of writing is clear and direct for the most part. A number of typographical errors are to be found in the early part of this book, of which one on page 58 is the most serious, the sense being hopelessly marred.

Twenty-five Years With God in India is a splendidly printed volume, not so orderly and logical, perhaps, in its arrangement of material as the other, but withal breathing a more fervent and deeply pietistic spirit throughout. Large portions of it could well be used for devotional reading. A very interesting feature of each book is the chapter near the close giving brief personal histories of all the workers who have at any time served on the field.

Edward Yoder

The Famine in Soviet Russia, 1919-1923: *The Operations of the American Relief Administration.* By H. H. Fisher, chief of the Historical Department, the American Relief Administration. Lecturer in History, Stanford University. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927. pp. x, 609.

Feeding the Hungry, Russia Famine, 1919-1925: *American Mennonite Relief Operations under the auspices of Mennonite Central Committee.* By P. C. Hiebert, A. M., Chairman of the Mennonite Central Committee, Author-Editor and Orie O. Miller, Assistant Secretary of the Mennonite Central Committee and Relief-Worker, Associate Editor. Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Mennonite Central Committee. 1928. pp. 450.

A comparison of these two books on famine relief in Russia raises, at the very outset, a point on the philosophy of writing a book of this type. The production of a thorough, scholarly piece of work requires, as a minimum, an adequate supply of source material, and a trained historian with the time and the inclination to sift and arrange the material to his definite end. If the writer attempts this kind of a book, he at once limits the circle of his readers. If, on the other hand, he is interested primarily in making a wide, general appeal, he puts more emphasis on incidents and local color. *The Famine in Soviet Russia* seems to fall definitely in the historical class, and *Feeding the Hungry* in the popular reading class.

The Famine in Soviet Russia was written by a trained historian, no doubt principally for historical purposes. Professor Fisher had at his disposal an almost unlimited supply of data, gathered by specialists. The bulk of this material had to be gone over and boiled down to an amount

that could be included in a one volume report of such a large undertaking. Relatively few people acquire the ability to convey in a brief compass the information essential to the purpose of their writing. Mr. Fisher seems to have succeeded admirably in doing this. He has told the story simply, tersely and interestingly. On the whole he has been fair to the American Relief Administration and its leaders, to the cooperating organizations, to the Soviet government and to the Russian people.

On the point of fairness, however, one exception should be noted. On page 163 Mr. Fisher refers to various organizations, including the American Mennonite Relief, and states that "they devoted their funds to the relief of members of their faith in Russia." It is true that most of the work of the Mennonites was done in and about settlements where Mennonites lived. But relief was given to all the needy in those settlements, regardless of their race, religion or political leanings. See also *Feeding the Hungry,* p. 151.

The general arrangement of Mr. Fisher's book is very good. In parts I and II the story is told in chronological order, so that one can easily follow developments. If the author wishes to digress, he warns the reader that he is doing so, and always brings him back safely to the main trend of thought. Part III takes up some special phases of the situation that need fuller treatment than could be given them in the running narrative. Having a general outline of the main events in mind, the reader easily fits in the new material. Excellent maps, charts and graphs are supplied to vivify the text. Little comment is necessary on the appendices. They are appropriate, and complete enough for the purpose of the book. The serious student is given ample references to material for further study.

The book gives a broad, comprehensive view of the problems of the American Relief Administration in Russia and in the United States, and of the social, economic and political factors that had a particular bearing on the situation. Throughout there is a pleasing modesty, feeling without sentimentality, and a proper recognition of personal merits and contributions without undue praise.

Feeding the Hungry covers somewhat the same ground as *The Famine in Soviet Russia* but with a different emphasis, and for a special group of readers. The preface suggests that the book was written "to give an account of the stewardship of the Mennonite Central Committee" and "to inform the donors what has been accomplished."

The writer who uses the first person in presenting historical material, as Professor Hiebert has done, often faces awkward situations, where he feels he ought to shift to the third person for modesty's sake, or take the alternative method of leaving out something important. An illustration of such a shift is seen on page 67ff. The careful reader will note others.

The introductory chapter, particularly the first part of it, seems to be very brief. Very little is said of the work that was done in France and Armenia, although that must have played an important part in preparing people for giving, and workers for administering, the gifts in the still larger venture in Russia. Of course a book on the Russian famine could

not do justice to the earlier events, but somewhat more might have been said about them. Who will undertake to tell the other story adequately, in another volume, while the material for it is still available?

With reference to the arrangement of the book, the first five chapters follow the chronological order quite closely, with the exception of the latter part of Chapter II, in which the reader is taken to the very end of the story, only to be brought back again to the beginning of it in Chapter III. Parts of Chapter II would have been easier to understand if they had been placed after Chapter IV or V. On the whole, however, the reader is carried along from 1920 until some progress has been made in the work of feeding in 1922, at which point he is left to find his own way through the rest of the story, with no connected narrative to guide him. What happened in Moscow after the beginning (described in Chapter IV) and what was done in the whole of the Volga section, is nowhere very fully given. How long work of some measure was carried on, what the general proportions were that it assumed, and the success in meeting needs, would have been worth while relating, not to the exclusion of the many interesting personal experiences recorded, but at least on a par with them. A map showing where the feeding and tractor work were done, and what the problems of transportation, distribution and supervision were, would also have helped the reader to get his bearings. The "Bird's Eye View" in the appendix is the nearest approach to a continuous narrative, but that ceases abruptly on August 1, 1923. Perhaps the only solution to the problems suggested would have been to write two books, one for popular reading and one for historians.

There is a great deal of human interest material in the book, fascinating pen pictures of what happened during those dreadful days of suffering. The writers have succeeded in doing what they set out to do, to inform the donors of what was accomplished, in a gripping, personal recital. The book has tremendous significance for the Mennonite church, in spite of its shortcomings as a history.

If one is interested in the great famine in Russia and events connected with it, he should read both books: Mr. Fisher's first, to get the general background and the American Relief Administration angle, and then Mr. Hiebert's, for the intimate pictures it gives, and for its interpretation of a great, united Mennonite undertaking.